



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Lietuvos sveikatos mokslų universiteto  
***VISUOMENĖS SVEIKATOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS***  
**(621A60003) VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT**  
***OF PUBLIC HEALTH (621A60003)***  
**STUDY PROGRAMME**  
at Lithuanian University of Health Sciences

Grupės vadovas:  
Team leader:

Mr. Andy Gibbs

Grupės nariai:  
Team members:

Prof. dr. Anita Villerusa

Dr. Sudhir Kurl

Dr. Tomas Tamulis

Doc. dr. Vytautas Jurkuvėnas

Ms. Kristina Daniūnaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language - English

Vilnius  
2014

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Visuomenės sveikata</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621A60003
Studijų sritis	Biomedicinos mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Visuomenės sveikata
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (2 metai)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Visuomenės sveikatos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2002 m. birželio 14 d.

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Public Health</i>
State code	621A60003
Study area	Biomedical Sciences
Study field	Public Health
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (2 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Public Health
Date of registration of the study programme	14 June 2002

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

# CONTENTS

CONTENTS .....	3
I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....	4
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	4
2. Curriculum design .....	5
3. Staff .....	6
4. Facilities and learning resources .....	7
5. Study process and student assessment.....	7
6. Programme management .....	8
III. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	9
IV. SUMMARY .....	11
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....	12

## I. INTRODUCTION

An international review team organized by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereinafter referred as SKVC) conducted evaluation of the study programme Master of Public Health (hereinafter referred as MPH) offered by the Lithuanian University of Health Sciences (hereinafter referred as LUHS). The evaluation included analysis of the Self Evaluation Report (hereinafter referred as SER), related documentation and information gathered on the site visit. A site visit to the LUHS was organized on March 5, 2014 with subsequent discussion of the programme under evaluation.

The evaluation team was lead by Mr. Andy Gibbs, Bologna Expert, Edinburgh Napier University, United Kingdom, consisted of Prof. dr. Anita Villerusa, Professor at Riga Stradins University, Latvia, dr. Sudhir Kurl, director of Kuopio Clinical Research Services at University of Eastern Finland, dr. Tomas Tamulis, lecturer at Kent State University College of Public Health, USA, dr. Vytautas Jurkuvėnas, deputy director, Institute of Hygiene, Vilnius, and Ms. Kristina Daniunaite, Phd student at Vilnius University, Lithuania.

The MPH programme was launched in 1998. According to the SER the format of the programme and the core study subjects have not been changed significantly since then. Nevertheless it was slightly amended taking into account comments and suggestions provided by the previous international evaluation teams. The most recent programme evaluation was undertaken by the SKVC in 2007 and programme was given full accreditation. This evaluation is the first one which is carried out following the new methodology for study programmes evaluation approved in 2010.

## II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

### *1. Programme aims and learning outcomes*

MPH programme is offered both in Lithuanian and English. It is a full-time programme and lasts for 2 academic years (4 semesters). The total number of ECTS credits is 120 (2240 hours), and self-study accounts for 30% of them. The MPH programme is a multidisciplinary programme and includes compulsory and elective study subjects in the selected specialization. Students can choose one of the four specializations (Child and Youth Health, Public Health and Nutrition, Health Ecology or Health Educology) acquired through elective to specialization-specific study subjects (27 credits per 3 semesters), specialization practice (3 credits) and research work (41 credits). The MPH programme in English designed for international students provides no specializations. International students have elective subjects (Social Pediatrics; Global Health; Occupational Medicine, Ergonomics and Environmental Sanitation; Public Health and Nutrition, 9 credits each) in the first, second and third semesters, respectively.

The review team agrees that the aim of the MPH programme to prepare professionals who take leadership in promoting modern public health and stated objectives are well defined, clear and logical.

Generic and subject specific learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered. They are based on the academic and/or professional requirements, set by national law, public needs and needs of the labor market taking into account institutional changes in public health (hereinafter referred as PH) (growing number of municipal public health bureaus and reduction of the public health service, controlling institution).

The study programme's committee shaped the aim, objectives and learning outcomes of the programme taking into account the European core competences for MPH education published by ASPHER in 2011, changing legal and labor market requirements in Lithuania, input of social partners and graduates obtain through the existing system of study programme quality assurance and monitoring system. Moreover, requirements set in the most recent draft of "Description of the Study Field of Public Health", Vilnius, 2013 had been taken into account as well.

Programme aims and learning outcomes are also closely linked with the University's mission and development strategy seeking for entering into international market. The review team confirms that the name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other.

Aims and learning outcomes are publicly available on the LUHS and its Study Centre's websites as well as in the national AIKOS database. Additionally, this study programme is advertised during higher education fairs, University Open Days including distribution of regularly published booklets on the study programmes offered by the LUHS.

The evaluation team and the staff of the programme agreed on the significance of the enhancing of the soft skills such as critical thinking, reflective practice, analysis and problem solving as close as possible to real life. Taken into account that majority of graduates are employed in practically oriented institutions rather than in the research oriented ones, the review team would like to suggest revising learning outcomes in order to ensure better balance between field work and research learning outcomes.

## ***2. Curriculum design***

The review team agrees that curriculum design is in accordance with national legal requirements in terms of volume of the programme, subjects of the study field and supplementary studies as well as number of subjects and ration of independent hours and time given for working on final theses. Study subjects and/or modules are spread evenly, their themes are not repetitive.

The content of the subjects and/or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies; Students have to make up their mind on their specialization right at the beginning of the MPH studies because there are mandatory specialization specific subjects in each semester and specialization practice in the last semester. The content of module and subjects are orientated towards the learning outcomes and practical skills of the students assuring complexity of the skills developed. The content of the subjects/modules are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The latest changes in the status of PH in Lithuania and recognized strategies for PH action are reflected in the content of the programme.

Traditional teaching forms are employed in order to achieve the competencies planned for the programme. The Faculty of Public Health (hereinafter referred as FPH) is also introducing problem based learning method which is already in place in the Medical Faculty. The review team received positive feedback from students about this form of learning.

The review team discussed and supported intentions of the FPH to revise balance between self-study and contact hours in the programme next year (reduction of contact hours).

The sequencing, timing, location and duration of practical placements should be reviewed to ensure that they are in line with specialization chosen and learning outcomes. Practical placements for individual students could be supported by learning agreements to make sure there

is a balanced focus on specialization and learning outcomes. Links with employers should be strengthened in order to get their systematic feedback which could be useful for the development of the study programme. This approach could serve a good deal for balancing research and practical work skills and for switching to problem based learning as planned by the FPH.

Familiarization with the master thesis led to the inference that more attention should be paid to methodological preparation for research because the review team members found discrepancies among aims, types and methods used in some studies. The review team would like to suggest Masters thesis to be more practically orientated, demonstrating critical thinking, reflecting existing practice in comparison to internationally accepted etc. Master program students are in favor of more practice. The review team heard from students that increase of credits for practice along with above mentioned balanced focus on outcomes and specialization could help students to become more confident and independent as well as better prepared to the real work in the future.

### *3. Staff*

Composition of the staff working in the programme (taught both in Lithuanian and English) meets legal requirements regarding to the number of scientific degree holders, research interests, duration of teaching and practical experience criteria (e.g., PhD holders make up to 94% of the Lithuanian programme and 86% of the English programme while required minimum is 80%; research interest of all staff members are related to the subjects they teach). Division of teaching staff between Lithuanian and English programmes is symbolic because vast majority of staff members are involved training of both student groups.

Most of academic staff has experience of or are part time employed in different health care institutions (e.g., Public Health Centers and Public Health Bureaus, Blood Donation Centre, research institutes etc.) or participate in national and international projects. It provides opportunities to obtain and update their practical, methodological and theoretical experience and facilitates achieving the unity of studies, research and practice in the study programme.

The review team concludes that the LUHS creates conditions for professional development of the programme staff members. This conclusion is based on the SER providing information on academic staff participation in scientific conferences, seminars and teachers' exchange programs, courses offered for the development of educational competencies at the Centre of and Teachers' Educational Competency, about visiting professors at the FPH and collaboration with Kazakh universities.

The existing system for assessing qualifications and suitability of lecturers in the LUHS (attestation takes place every 5 years) stimulates continuous development of staff members. Staff members' CVs and list of publications confirm that the FPH takes care of the quality of staff members. The staff age structure and duration of employment in the programme demonstrates stability of the programme.

The review team concludes that the staff of the study programme is knowledgeable and experienced with good scientific and practical background meeting all legal requirements and has no doubts that qualifications and number of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes. The teaching staff is able to ensure an adequate provision of the programme and the higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme. The teaching staff of the programme is involved in research directly related to the study programme.

#### ***4. Facilities and learning resources***

The FPH uses temporary premises of a former secondary school located at Vydūnas campus, Šiaurės av. 57 with sufficient number of rooms suitable for lectures, seminars, computer classes and laboratory work. Classrooms are in good condition, equipped with white boards, computers and multimedia projectors and furniture that can be rearranged for work in groups. The University is planning to build a new modern building for the FPH. The review team had possibility to see the design of building. Construction is expected to be finished by the middle of the year 2015.

The practice for the MPH students takes place in various public health institutions not necessarily in Kaunas and sometimes is arranged by students themselves. A tripartite contract among the student, the University and the host institution is signed for the whole period of practice, defining the purpose of practice, expected results, parties' rights, obligations and other conditions and procedures. There is a system for the practice supervision and evaluation of individual work assessment of students. The review team did not have possibility to visit those sites however comments of employers, graduates and current students indicate that there is room for improvement including better mentoring and task performance demonstration having in mind selected specializations and learning outcomes set.

Students of the MPH program have full access to the modern and contemporary LUHS Library and Information Centre opened in 2007. Main teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications) required for the students of the programme are available at the LUHS Library and reading rooms. The library has unlimited free access to the Science Direct/SciVerse, Cochrane Library, EBSCO Publishing, BMJ Journals, Cambridge Journals Online, Springer Link, Wiley Online Library and other. Online access to the WHO statistical databases, such as WHO Statistical Information System, the WHO European Health for All Database, the Information System of Lithuanian Health Indicators, the Database of Lithuanian Population Mortality Indices and other, is also unlimited. As the Library is the WHO documentation centre in Lithuania, it has a special collection of WHO publications.

Taking into account information presented in the SER and observations during the site visit the review team came to the conclusion that the premises for studies and the teaching and learning equipment are adequate both in size and quality. The FPH has adequate arrangements for students' practice and teaching materials are adequate to the programme's needs and accessible to students.

#### ***5. Study process and student assessment***

The MPH programme is open to individuals who have completed a bachelor's degree and have knowledge of biology, physiology and nature sciences. Admission is carried out in accordance with the rules for admission to LUHS provided on the University website. Admission to graduate studies is held in the FPH while selection of international students is performed by the Centre of International Relations and Studies in collaboration the Faculty. There is no real competition for enrolling to study the MPH program. It looks like there are more state funded positions than applications (all those applied were accepted). The competitive score in the academic year 2011/2012 was 10.36 (24 enrolled), in 2012/2013 – 10.86 (24 enrolled) and 2013/2014 - 10.62 (15 enrolled).

The vast majority of entrees hold bachelor degree in public health and are comfortable with the programme. The review team realized that holders of non biomedical diploma experience some problems because of lack of knowledge in epidemiology, statistics etc. Despite of special

consultations offered by the University it is not always easy for them to catch up with their group mates.

Study process has got more variety with organization of practical education in broader spectrum of institutions, Public Health Bureaus, were set up (Kaunas PHB was established in 2008) and introduction of an intranet communication platform (FirstClass) into the studying process that improved communication between teachers and students, facilitating sharing information and management of the study process.

According to the SER students of the MPH programme are regularly informed about possibilities to participate in the Erasmus Exchange programme, scholarship competitions etc. All students can participate in the activities of the LUHS student science society, that has the public health section and brings together not only students studying public health in the bachelor's and master's programs, but also those interested in public health in general. Students are given opportunities to improve their scientific planning and performance competencies there. However, the review team heard from students that real possibilities to participate in student mobility and research programs are limited because of rear calls and few positions advertized.

According to the LUHS Senate approved documents, students can be accommodated in the dormitories available, enjoy sport center facilities, receive granted study loans, merit-based scholarships etc. International students of the LUHS may have master or doctoral students' mentor for the adaptation period.

The latest regulation for assessment of student's academic achievements came into force on 1 September 2013. The composition of the assessment score is given in detail in the descriptions of every subject and students are directly informed about their academic achievements on the Internet database with their own username and password. The knowledge and skills of master's students are assessed during the course of the subjects and at the end of the studies. A cumulative score is used for the assessment of learning outcomes. It gives students the opportunity to evaluate the results of the study process and motivates students to achieve better results. The review team learned that students sometimes disagree with the assessment but no explanation is provided. The review team discussed and agreed that the processes for gathering feedback from students needs to be more systematic and should engage students in filing in questioners more actively than they do it now.

Even though students enjoy state paid places many of them do not go to work in PH institutions. The data collected by the Career Centre showed that in 2013, 56% of the graduates from the MPH programme were employed as a public health specialist in the public health sector, and 44% of the graduates were employed in other institutions closely related to the public health sector. It is a significant improvement in employment as a public health specialist in the public health sector comparing to 25% found by Institute of Hygiene when analyzing the situation of the graduates of 2004-2005.

## ***6. Programme management***

Programme management involves three levels: university, faculty and department level with clearly allocated roles and responsibilities in evaluation, decision making, implementation and monitoring of implementation of the programme. The system of monitoring is well presented in the SER and the review team is convinced that the system works to some extend during the meetings with faculty, social partners and students. It is clear that the programme is dynamic and reacts to changes taking place in the national public health system.

According to a LUHS's resolution from March 2012, students' and teachers' opinions on the study process, curriculum and study resources have to be surveyed at least once a year; opinions of graduates and employers on the competencies acquired during the studies have to be surveyed at least once in 2 years and results of surveys have to be published on the University website. The first results on the evaluation provided in the SER show only very small number of teaching staff and students had filled in the questionnaires provided. However, the review team strongly believes that more effective collection of information could significantly improve programme's management.

Students are involved in the program management by providing their opinion in the quality of subjects, study resources and the quality of study process. According to SER the Study Programme Committee meets with students at least once a semester in order to discuss the problems in the study process. Even though students are encouraged to contact the heads of departments and the dean directly and suggest improvements of the study programme, students met during the visit said that even if they do not understand their assessment result they do not complain about it. Some students were critical about mandatory attendance of lectures believing that some topics could be left for self-studies.

Social partners are expected to make their input to the quality of study process while participating in the Faculty Council, the Commission of Studies and Science, the Study Programme Committee, the Qualifying Commission of Final Thesis Defense activities and mentoring student practice in their own institutions. The review team noted that students were not as optimistic as administration of the FPH and employers about arrangement of practice when it does not meet their specific expectations.

Alumni could be also more actively involved into the development of the programme. Graduates whom the review panel met expressed a wish to participate in University's life more as well.

The review team concludes that, although there is some place for, improvement the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Learning outcomes should be reviewed to make the balance between research and practical application clear.
2. The balance between research work and practice should be reviewed to ensure that the programme prepares students for the workplace rather than exceptionally for the career in academia (note: the review team understands that it could be a common problem of many Lithuanian higher education institutions).
3. Teaching methods should move from a teacher to a learner focus. This should include revision of the distribution of the contact hours and maybe creation of systematic strategy for teaching development.
4. The sequencing, timing, location and duration of practice should be reviewed to ensure that learning outcomes are achieved.
5. Links with employers should be developed to gather systematic feedback which could be significantly important for the development of the programme.
6. More attention should be given to preparation for Master thesis. Masters thesis should be more practically orientated.

7. There should be explicit learning of soft skills such as critical thinking, reflective practice, analysis and problem solving.
8. Processes for gathering feedback from students should be more systematic and engaging in order to get more information than the current voluntary method allows.
9. Arrangements to better engage Alumni and seek their views in programme development need to be improved.

#### IV. SUMMARY

The MPH has been trying to become recognized modern public health programme not only in Lithuania but also internationally since introduction in 1998. The programme has clear aim and objectives as well as learning outcomes. They are based on academic and professional requirements, public needs and needs of labour market. Even though the stated generic and subject-specific programme outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of education the review team thinks that practical and research aspects of the programme could be better balanced. This suggestion is based on the fact that majority of MPH diploma holders go to work in practical institutions.

The curriculum design meets all national legal requirements including balance between contact hours and students' individual work. However, the review team suggest considering further reduction of contact hours providing more opportunities for enhancement of analytical, critical and creative, work organization capacity building skills.

Staff composition of the FPH is well balanced possessing pedagogical, scientific and practical expertise in the subjects they teach. University stimulates permanent staff development by periodic qualification of staff members requiring established research and pedagogical productivity. The review team welcomes well balanced staff composition of the programme.

MPH students and staff use modern library but feel temporal inconveniences because of adaptation to the hosting facilities. However the review team shares optimism of the FPH related to the new campus under construction. The review team also believes that more emphases should be put on practice arrangements including more careful selection of institutions, criteria for measuring students' productive work during the practice and in terms of expected learning outcomes.

Even though the MPH program is of a high quality the review team sees opportunities for further improvement by developing closer collaboration of all parties involved (administration, staff, students, alumni, employers) into more open and intense opinion exchange on the suitability and quality of each subject, teaching forms, evaluation of results etc. weighting them by their impact in preparation of professionals who are going to take leadership in promoting modern public health through population-based practice, research and policy-making to respond to the needs of public health in the population.

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Public Health* (state code – 621A60003) at Lithuanian University of Health Sciences 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	4
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Staff	4
4.	Material resources	3
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	3
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	3
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>20</b>

\*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:

Mr. Andy Gibbs

Grupės nariai:  
Team members:

Prof. dr. Anita Villerusa

Dr. Sudhir Kurl

Dr. Tomas Tamulis

Doc. dr. Vytautas Jurkuvėnas

Ms. Kristina Daniūnaitė

**LIETUVOS SVEIKATOS MOKSLŲ UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS  
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *VISUOMENĖS SVEIKATA* (VALSTYBINIS  
KODAS – 621A60003) 2014-05-28 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ  
NR. SV4-261 IŠRAŠAS**

&lt;...&gt;

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Lietuvos sveikatos mokslų universiteto studijų programa *Visuomenės sveikata* (valstybinis kodas – 621A60003) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	4
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	4
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	<b>Iš viso:</b>	<b>20</b>

\* 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)

&lt;...&gt;

**IV. SANTRAUKA**

Nuo Visuomenės sveikatos magistrantūros programos sukūrimo 1998 m. buvo stengiamasi, kad ir Lietuvoje, ir tarptautiniu lygiu ji būtų pripažinta kaip šiuolaikiška visuomenės sveikatos programa. Programos tikslas, uždaviniai ir studijų rezultatai yra aiškūs. Jie suformuluoti remiantis akademiniais ir profesiniais reikalavimais, visuomenės ir darbo rinkos poreikiais. Nors nurodyti bendri programos ir konkrečių dalykų rezultatai nuosekliai atitinka studijų pobūdį ir lygį, taip pat studijų pakopą, ekspertų grupė mano, kad pagal programą reikėtų užtikrinti geresnę praktinių aspektų ir mokslinės veiklos pusiausvyrą. Šis pasiūlymas paremtas tuo, kad dauguma visuomenės sveikatos magistro diplomus įgijusių absolventų vėliau dirba praktinį darbą institucijose.

Turinio struktūra atitinka visus nacionalinius teisinius reikalavimus, įskaitant reikalavimą dėl kontaktinių valandų ir studentų savarankiško darbo derinimo. Tačiau ekspertų grupė siūlo apsvarstyti galimybę dar labiau sumažinti kontaktinių valandų skaičių ir suteikti daugiau galimybių stiprinti analitinius, kritiško mąstymo įgūdžius, kūrybiškumą, darbo organizavimo gebėjimus.

Visuomenės sveikatos fakulteto personalo struktūros pusiausvyra yra gera, personalas turi pedagoginės, mokslinės ir praktinės patirties dėstomų dalykų srityse. Universitetas skatina nuolatinio personalo tobulinimąsi – periodiškai atliekami personalo kvalifikacijos vertinimai, reikalaujama rezultatyvios mokslinės veiklos ir pedagoginio darbo. Ekspertų grupė palankiai vertina gerai suderintą programos personalo struktūrą.

Visuomenės sveikatos magistrantūros programos studentai ir personalas naudojami šiuolaikiška biblioteka, tačiau patiria laikinų nepatogumų, nes turi prisitaikyti prie laikinų patalpų. Tačiau ekspertų grupė, kaip ir Visuomenės sveikatos fakultetas, optimistiškai žvelgia į galimybes įsikelti į naujas patalpas. Ekspertų grupė taip pat yra įsitikinusi, kad daugiau dėmesio reikia skirti mokomajai praktikai organizuoti, taip pat kruopščiau rinktis institucijas ir kriterijus, pagal kuriuos per mokomąją praktiką bus vertinami studentų darbo rezultatai ir lyginami su numatytais studijų rezultatais.

Nors visuomenės sveikatos magistrantūros programa yra aukštos kokybės programa, ekspertų grupė mato galimybių ją dar patobulinti – plėtoti glaudesnę visų su šia programa susijusių šalių, (administracijos, personalo, studentų, absolventų, darbdavių) bendradarbiavimą, kad atviriau ir intensyviau būtų keičiamasi nuomonėmis apie kiekvieno dalyko tinkamumą ir kokybę, mokymo formas, rezultatų vertinimą ir pan., palyginant šiuos aspektus pagal tai, kaip kiekvienas iš jų prisideda rengiant specialistus, ateityje tapsiančius šiuolaikiškų visuomenės sveikatos stiprinimo programų vadovais, kurie dirbdami su gyventojais, vykdydami mokslinę veiklą ir formuodami politiką tenkins su visuomenės sveikata susijusius gyventojų poreikius.

<...>

### **III. REKOMENDACIJOS**

1. Studijų rezultatus reikėtų pakoreguoti taip, kad būtų užtikrinta aiški mokslinės veiklos ir praktinio jos pritaikymo pusiausvyra.
2. Reikėtų pakoreguoti mokslinės veiklos ir praktikos pusiausvyrą – užtikrinti, kad pagal programą studentai būtų rengiami darbui, o ne išskirtinai akademinėi karjerai (pastaba: ekspertų grupė mano, kad tai gali būti bendra daugelio Lietuvos aukštojo mokslo institucijų problema).
3. Mokymo metodus reikėtų labiau orientuoti ne į dėstytoją, bet į studentą. Tuo tikslu taip pat reikėtų persvarstyti kontaktinių valandų paskirstymą ir galbūt parengti sistemine mokymo plėtojimo strategiją.
4. Reikėtų persvarstyti mokomosios praktikos eiliškumą, laiką, vietą ir trukmę, siekiant užtikrinti, kad būtų pasiekti studijų rezultatai.
5. Reikėtų išplėtoti ryšius su darbdaviais, kad būtų sistemiškai renkami atsiliepimai, nes jie galėtų daug padėti plėtojant programą.
6. Daugiau dėmesio reikėtų skirti magistro baigiamojo darbo rašymui. Magistro baigiamajame darbe daugiau dėmesio reiktų skirti praktiniams aspektams.
7. Reikėtų konkrečiai ugdyti socialinius emocinius gebėjimus, pavyzdžiui, kritišką mąstymą, refleksyviąją praktiką, gebėjimą analizuoti ir spręsti problemas.
8. Procesai, per kuriuos renkami studentų atsiliepimai, turėtų būti sistemiškesni ir įtraukesni, kad būtų surenkama daugiau informacijos negu dabar, taikant savanorišką metodą.
9. Reikia tobulinti metodus, kuriais būtų aktyviau įtraukiami absolventai ir būtų klausiamųjų nuomonės dėl programos tobulinimo poreikio.

<...>

---

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)