STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Klaipėdos universiteto

STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *LITERATŪROLOGIJA (621Q20005)*

VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

EVALUATION REPORT

OF *LITERARY SCIENCE* (*621Q20005*)

STUDY PROGRAMME

at Klaipėda University

1. **Prof. Dr. Andrew Goodspeed (team leader)** *academic,*

2. **Prof. Dr. Srebren Dizdar,** *academic,*

3. **Prof. Dr. Joel Kuortti,** *academic,*

4. **Mr. Gintaras Bleizgys,** *representative of social partners,*

5. **Ms. Alisa Stunžaitė,** *students' representative*.

Evaluation coordinator - **Mr. Pranas Stankus**

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Literatūrologija
Valstybinis kodas	621Q20005
Studijų sritis	Humanitariniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Literatūrologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antra
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Literatūrologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2007-01-29

_____

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Literary Science
State code	621Q20005
Study area	Humanities studies
Study field	Literary Science
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Literary Science
Date of registration of the study programme	2007-01-29

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2. General

The Application documentation submitted by the HEI follows the outline recommended by the SKVC. Along with the self-evaluation report (hereafter – SER) and annexes, the following additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document

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

This programme is offered by the Department of Literature, Faculty of Humanities, of Klaipeda University. As noted in the SER, Klaipeda University was established formally on the 1st of

January 1991, by resolution 1-640 of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Lithuania. The Faculty of Humanities is one of seven Faculties in the University. KU offers degrees in all three cycles of tertiary study—undergraduate, master, and doctoral.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. 1-01-151 of Acting Director of SKVC. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 14 April 2015.

1. **Prof. Dr. Andrew Goodspeed (team leader)** *South East European University, Provost, Republic of Macedonia,*
2. **Prof. Dr. Srebren Dizdar,** *University of Sarajevo, Full Professor, English Literature, Bosnia and Herzegovina,*
3. **Prof. Dr. Joel Kuortti,** *University of Turku, Professor, Finland,*
4. **Mr. Gintaras Bleizgys,** *representative of social partners, Lithuania,*
5. **Ms. Alisa Stunžaitė,** *students' representative, Lithuania*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

Klaipeda University (hereafter – KU) offers a two-year, 120 credit 2nd Cycle programme in the field of Literary Science. It is intended to be completed within an on-time graduation period of two years, in which the first three semesters will incorporate taught courses, and the fourth will result in a final thesis preparation. The successful graduate of this programme will receive the professional qualification of Master of Literary Science.

The aims of the programme appear twofold, although these two aims are not exclusive and are intended to be complimentary. The first intention is to promote and develop advanced academic skills in the fields of literary scholarship and theory, with the potential result of producing a well-rounded group of future researchers and scholars. The second aim of the programme is, in a more general sense, to provide thoughtful and informed interpreters of

Lithuanian and Baltic culture (with particular emphasis on Prussian Lithuania), in order to promote local culture, assist in political and cultural integration movements, and to provide academic and social leadership on cultural matters in the areas of Lithuania and the Baltic generally. As such, the programme aims are both specific and general; there is a precise intention for professional development and application of the skills developed in the programme, yet there is a broader cultural intention that recognizes that the abilities developed herein may well have a more broad application in society.

These aims are generally consistent with the broad higher educational trend towards non-specialist applications of specialized knowledge, yet the employability of graduates is a matter of concern. As the KU acknowledges in the SER, 'employees with the Master's degree are underappreciated, and their research competences are not fully exploited.' (SER, 2015, 2.1.1.30) Although the SER states that publishing (books, newspapers, journals) remains a potential market for graduates, it is unclear whether or not the highly specialized literary focus of the programme fully meets public needs, or is adequately recognized by the general culture as making a necessary contribution.

The team is somewhat concerned that this narrow focus may restrict the appeal of the programme for potential student recruits, who may desire a more broad-based literary studies programme that includes wider categories of European literatures. This restriction may be partially addressed by seeking incoming staff mobility lecturers, particularly those who can lecture in major European languages (particularly English). A further possibility will be to keep the focus on Lithuanian literary studies as the core of the programme, but to offer more broad cultural offerings (such as Lithuania in Baltic Area Studies; Comparative Mythology; Cultural Studies; History and Culture of the Baltic Area, etc.) This would build upon strengths of the programme, which building a more comprehensive intellectual context for the students. Also, developing teaching courses should include the social partners and take into account what workforce is needed for jobs in cultural institutions, schools and other enterprises.

The learning outcomes for the programme are clear, and are based on five categories: Knowledge and its Application; Research Abilities; Special Abilities; Social Abilities; and Personal Abilities. Each of these is subdivided into three specific learning outcomes (with the exception of 'Special Abilities,' which subdivides into two learning outcomes). These are clearly stated and are consistent with such descriptions for programmes of this level in other European countries. The learning outcomes are therefore appropriate for the programme as structured. As mentioned above, however, it is unclear whether the heavy orientation on specialist literature

will contribute entirely successfully to the non-literary application of the skills developed in the programme (as, for example, journalistic or editorial employment).

Here is a point of concern to be raised about the orientation of the programme to the labour market. Although the programme looks admirably suited to produce literary scholars and theorists, or perhaps more broadly cultural commentators and theorists, it is unclear what professional advantage graduates would have outside of strictly academic fields. The programme SER (2015, 2.1.2.34) states that 'the most gifted [graduates] can become professional researchers,' but also notes that 'graduates from the programme are not entitled to work in a comprehensive school before they acquire teacher's qualification' (SER, 2015, 2.1.1.30). Unfortunately, no elements of in-employment praxis are included in the taught courses, which would serve to establish more broad opportunities for graduate employability.

The aims and the structure of the programme are consistent with programmes of this level and duration in Europe. A successful graduate of this programme will have progressed through a series of courses that are appropriate for the 2nd Cycle of studies and are applicable, if desired, in 3rd Cycle study. Specific programme details are given below, 2.2., in the analysis of the curriculum. The programme places a significant emphasis on the literature and culture of Lithuania and Prussian Lithuania that are not common in other programmes elsewhere; as stated above, however, this emphasis is intended to promote and preserve Lithuanian culture in the context of cultural integration and comparative literature. Thus, the presence of numerous Lithuanian literary and cultural courses is, by design, a distinguishing characteristic of this programme.

2.2. Curriculum design

The Programme in Literary Science appears compliant with the relevant laws. The University itself was founded on 1 January 1991 by Resolution 1-640 of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Lithuania. As an institution it seems to have remained obedient to the laws of Lithuania, as evidenced by the 8 June 2011 decision (Order V-1019) that granted KU the right to offer doctoral studies in the field of Philology. After SER analysis it is clear that the institution is compliant with all laws pertaining to the provision of instruction and the awarding of degrees, and there is nothing to suggest that the Masters Programme in Literaturology is illicit or illegal.

The curriculum itself offers three semesters of taught courses, followed by a thesis semester. In each of the three taught semesters, the student is expected to take five courses. For those courses, three appear to be mandatory, and two elective. Thus, in the first semester, the

obligatory courses are: The Bible and Literature; Lithuanian Literature and Antiquity; and European Context and Cultural Expression of Pietism in Lithuania Minor. In the second semester, the obligatory courses are: Modern Theories of Literature; Comparative Mythology; and Culture of Lithuania Minor. In the third semester the obligatory courses are: Russian Silver Age Literature; Sociology of Literature; and Typography and Imagology of Lithuania Minor in Works in East Prussian Literature. These are the courses that all successful graduates will be obligated to have taken and passed. A variety of elective courses exist for the other two slots in each semester's requirements. These elective courses also generally maintain the programme's focus upon regional culture and literature, with some general exceptions (i.e. Shakespeare and Cinema). As noted above, these elective offerings must be diversified to include additional subjects beyond the primarily Lithuanian focus of this programme (several suggestions may be found in).

The basic structure of credit allocations is as follows (as reported in the programme SER, 2015, 2.2.1.37): the mandatory courses occupy 60 credits; the electives generate 18 credits; the research papers that are preparatory for the writing of the MA thesis constitute 12 credits; and the research, composition and defence of the thesis account for the remaining 30 credits. Individual courses vary among 8 to 6 to 4 credits. The course structures and credit allocations seem consistent with European practice, and are easily comprehensible to external reviewers or mobility partners.

As may be seen by the offerings of the taught portion of this degree, there is a heavy emphasis on the culture and literature of the Lithuanian and Baltic area. This is, as stated above, intentional, and may provide graduates with unusual and marketable expertise in an expanding western research community. The weakness of this approach, of course, is that it does sacrifice potential opportunities for broader interests; this report will recommend that additional courses be incorporated into the offering, to provide wider selections of elective offerings. As presently structured, though, the curriculum does not seem unduly repetitive, although certain overlaps are inevitable. It would certainly seem to meet the basic criteria for a good curriculum: it is comparable with other programmes of this level; it appears to be consecutive (i.e. increasing difficulty); and it should teach graduates the skills to pursue other areas of research not directly taught in the curriculum itself. Thus a successful graduate is likely to be an intellectually autonomous researcher needing little significant additional assistance.

Prussian Lithuania (Lithuania Minor) history and culture is special because here the Lutheran Church was prominent (as compared with the other parts of Lithuania, dominated by the Catholic Church). Prussian Lithuania (Lithuania Minor) history and culture research should

be very closely connected with the exploration of Protestant theology. The vast majority of Prussian Lithuania (Lithuania Minor) literary creators were Protestant church officials and pastors. They are the substructure throughout Prussian Lithuania culture and literature. Taught programs should be analyzed in a more Protestant worldview and note its differences from the Catholic worldview. Cooperation with Protestant theology and culture as studied in foreign universities could offer an opportunity to Klaipeda University open up to international programmes, international student exchange programs and attract new students, lest the study programme of Literary Science and related activities become too locally oriented and become unviable.

As this is primarily a programme intended to promote literature and literary analysis as cultural media, it is a well-structured and intellectually defensible series of courses. It would certainly appeal to the research interests of students whose particular specialities are either Lithuanian literature or, more generally, Baltic literature. For those students, it is well designed to achieve the learning outcomes of the programme. It remains to be established, however, whether or not the direct applicability of the learning outcomes to non-literary (or non-academic) employments is as direct as the SER implies. It is also a major concern of the authorial team that there were no student enrolments in the academic year 2014-2015. This result is, in a sense, representative of the failure of this programme to position itself successfully in the society from which it might draw students. It is advisable for the programme staff to build strong relations with social partners in order to promote the skills developed and improved by following this degree course. Potential employers of graduates should also be closely involved in the development or review of curricula.

The curriculum as structured seems notably balanced, at least given the intended focus on Lithuanian literary studies. There are numerous opportunities for students to pursue local literary interests. Other courses—for example, Comparative Mythology or Philosophy of Culture—offer more broad theoretical approaches. Finally, there are several courses that address much wider cultural horizons (Shakespeare and Cinema, The Bible in Literature). The programme thus does appear to be contemporary in structure, although an approach to other literature and culture courses would greatly modernise this offering. One may raise, however, a minor note of concern about the delivery of this programme. As noted in the SER (2105, 2.2.2.40), 'teachers avoid using transparencies and explain it by possible student distraction.' It seems odd that, in 2015, teachers are still hesitant to use transparencies, particularly with students who are intended to be interpreters of the written word. It is advisable that attention be paid to the modernity and pedagogical practice of the programme as delivered.

2.3. Teaching staff

The teaching/academic staff of KU Literary Science (KULS) consists of 9 teachers, primarily from the Department of Literature, where 8 teachers have been employed on a full-time basis at KU, and Prof. Sigita Barniškienė works full-time in Vytautas Magnus University (Kaunas). It should be observed that the total of 13 professors have taught different courses within the Department in the recent periods. Their respective CVs have been presented in the KULS SER file package. The current structure of 5 full professors (55.5%) and 3 associate professors (33.3%) — one of whom is in the category of 'recognised artist' — may be considered quite satisfactory in terms of their academic degrees and other acquired competences and skills, as well as a substantial experience in teaching.

The KULS SER says that the composition of the academic staff that implements the MA Literature study programme complies with the requirements of the Order of the Minister of Higher Education and Science *On the Approval of the Descriptor of General Requirements for Graduate Study Programmes* (No. V-826, 3 June 2010) which is correct based on SER analysis.

The teaching staff is employed full time by the university and selected and hired in accordance with the general requirements of KU. Pedagogical and scientific work of the teaching staff is assessed in attesting procedures every five years. The age profile of the teaching team is satisfactory. Out of 13 persons listed, 5 staff members of the KULS are over 60 years old, the other 5 are in their fifties, and all of them have quite a long professional, teaching and research experience. The remaining 3 members of the staff are younger than 50. It means that teachers with significant professional experience are predominant in the staff structure, but one should think of the future, when some of those who are over 60 will definitely retire. At the moment, there is only one MA graduate who pursues her doctoral studies within the given scope of study programme, but, as it has been revealed during the interview, her doctoral topic has been suggested by her former professors and not, primarily, as her own continuous academic interest.

The ratio of the programme implementing staff and students currently is more than sufficient for the programme, given the small number of students who, in fact, pursue MA in Literary Science. The number of students has been on a steady decrease, in the period under review, as follows: 11 in 2010, 5 in 2011, 7 in 2012, 5 in 2013, and none /0/ in 2014 (data presented in the Table 9 of SER, p. 22). Under such circumstances, it is not possible to evaluate expected academic interaction between students and their teachers, since the emphasis in the study process had definitely been placed on independent work of students (80%), whereas in-class lectures and seminars had not been held on a regular basis, mainly due to the fact that most

of students worked and the schedule of classes was adjusted to their available time, mostly in the afternoons. In addition, since most of students happen to be girls, who started their families and had children during their envisaged period of MA study programme, it appeared that the study process was often affected by these situations. The same applies to the number of students who took their degrees in the same period. It is obvious that they extend the period of study needed for the completion of all the requirements due to a number of reasons primarily related to their work loads and personal situations, but it opens the major issue that deals with the overall interest for such studies and the actual results attained, i.e. learning outcomes.

Given the experience in the field, a sufficient number of staff members participated in some research projects, primarily oriented towards the narrowly focused interest of eastern Prussian/Western Lithuanian literature in a somewhat closed period in the past. On the other hand, only one staff member was listed to have participated in the professional development scheme. The published academic output is within the expected scope of such a specialised and close field of interest, as well as public lectures and seminars delivered and actual involvement in research directly related to the study programme being reviewed. It remains rather limited in both areas, usually confined to the Klaipėda region, and only to a lesser extent to the whole of Lithuania. However, there is a clear limitation in view of possible collaboration with similar specialised programmes in the Baltic Sea Area countries, where actual or possible partners and counterparts are either scarce or non-existing.

It is also reflected in the meagre collaboration with academics who share similar research interests. The number of visiting professors from other European universities are giving lectures at KULS could be definitely higher and more frequent. Their presence might help the programme and Klaipėda academics to find somewhat re-shaped and re-designed format of their current MA study programme that definitely needs to be in tune with the present and, especially, with the future, if the programme wants to continue to attract new students and to retain its core focus of academic research. The same applies to currently non-existing initiated activities or partnerships in national or international projects, which might, potentially, open up the study programme for beneficiary exchanges and its promotion among fellow-colleagues and potential international students.

In this way, the only advantage that the MA study programme may, eventually, has for the future lies in intensive efforts of the staff members, who happen to be recognised specialists in their respective fields, and have extensive academic and research experience; in attracting prospective students, well-motivated to benefit from their knowledge and competence. On the other hand, given the fact that most of the staff does not use diverse EU and other exchange

opportunity programmes in order to further develop their professional competences and skills, might be seen as the major drawback in near future that could end up in the programme's closure despite the pronounced determination of the current academics in KU to keep it running.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The actual KU premises (the classrooms and reading rooms) have been properly furnished, including computer equipment, and are adequate in size and quality. Given the small number of students there is no need to dedicate specific premises for their work at KU, since most of them come to classes on specific days and times, due to their work and personal obligations outside the study programme.

Plenty of books and other resources on the central focus of studies, including Protestantism and Reformation in German, have been offered to both the staff and students, but they are to be found primarily in the Theology collection. The holdings pertaining to the study programme are quite limited, even when titles from other fields of expertise, such as history, archaeology or other relevant disciplines, important to the broader picture of Klaipėda region cultural heritage have been taken into account. The main KU library lacks diversified resources in terms of more appropriate titles, both in printed or electronic form, as well the access to different yet highly relevant periodicals and databases. However, the publications indicated in course descriptions could be definitely more numerous, structured and diverse and show a variety of more recent sources dealing with theoretical and critical primary and secondary sources necessary for the research. This situation has been explained by the lack of KU funds for the purchase and high prices of printed materials, but more electronic sources could have replaced the printed books.

Since the knowledge of foreign languages, English in particular, and the use of resources has not been a stronger quality of most students, and, to some extent, of the academic staff, the issue of obtaining more appropriate titles must coincide with the increased competence to use them in a more diversified context. That is why the inclusion of BA graduates from different philology studies, other than Lithuanian only, can be a real asset towards the policy of supplying more international resources for the study programme, in addition to those that can be obtained within the context of Lithuania, and not just the Klaipėda region.

2.5. The study process and students' performance assessment

Student admission to the MA programme of Literary Science is based on a previously completed BA in Philology, either Lithuanian or other language (SER 2.5.1, Student selection).

80 % of the applicants have a BA in Lithuanian Philology. The background of the remaining 20 % is a BA from other Humanities subjects or from other Faculties (especially Arts, Pedagogy, Social Sciences) – over the period under evaluation the total number of these is approximately 1–4 annually (SER 2.5, #60, #62). The basic admission process is quite transparent, with minimum requirements and a calculated mean of grades (#61). In 2014 there were only 2 applicants and no group was formed. Thus, it would be critical to increase interest in the programme by making the admission process more transparent for the applicants from other subjects than Lithuanian Philology.

The KU SER does not indicate what is the annual student quota set by the Rector's Office. The decreasing number of applicants and admissions poses a problem for sustaining the quality of accepted students (#64). The range of the highest and lowest scores changes drastically from 2012 to 2013 (Table 8), but this change is due to a new scale, as was explained during the visit. Overall, the admission of 7 out of 8 (in 2012) and 5 out of 5 (in 2013) applicants does not seem selective.

The study process is structured according to the demands of students' jobs (#65). While this is perhaps necessary and considerate towards the students, it does not encourage full time studies. Exams are the major assessment method, and the exam schedule is clear (#66, #69). It is mentioned that the small number of students enables the staff to supervise the students individually and thus reduce the dropout rate. The graduating figures do not however substantiate this as the number of graduates after two years indicates the dropout rate to be between 10–40 % (Table 9). Further clarification of this was given in the discussions, and many of the apparent dropouts return later to complete their studies. It was said to be usual that students take one-year leaves, and these are sometimes longer.

The continuous monitoring of the students' progress and their learning outcomes is thorough and provides good measures for enabling the students to complete their studies. Academic advisors are mentioned (2.5.2, #65) but their role and duties are not described. Such a system is evidently very functional especially in a small department, and five members of the staff are elsewhere (2.3.2, #50) mentioned also as academic advisors of doctoral studies (R. Balsys, R. Bončkutė, A. Ramonas, D. Stančienė, S. Barniškienė). The overall departmental actions to enhance the process of studies seem adequate.

The organization of the study process is not clearly defined in the report nor was it explained clearly during the meetings. On the one hand students are welcome to organize academic activity in a convenient way for themselves but, on the other, the report and the meeting claimed that students fail to attend seminars and lectures due to conditions related to

their work. Moreover, the majority of the lectures are organized in an old-fashioned way as in most of the lectures students simply listen to the teachers talk. The majority of the students do not want to continue their studies into the third cycle. Even though it was blamed on the low number of state funded places, an overall number of doctoral studies students are only 4 since 2011. The students participating in the meeting did not show any will to continue their studies.

Professional activities of the majority of graduates do not meet the programme providers' expectations. Many students after graduation choose the career of a teacher; however the programme does not provide with teacher's qualification.

Students are "granted an opportunity" to participate in research activities in student scientific conferences and national conferences (#72), but this point is not specified, nor is its success evaluated. Also other non-formal practices (literary evenings, lectures, etc.) are mentioned without details (#82), and they were not elaborated in the discussions.

For student mobility, the collaborative links with six universities abroad are mentioned but the nature of these is not explicated either in the SER (#75) or in the discussions. A major impediment for the students is the lack of access to or participation in international exchanges. There are annual seminars to inform the students about the international exchange programmes, projects and internships (#70), but only one student is reported to have participated in 2010, but it is not mentioned under what type of programme (one record is also listed from 2008); one student is reported to participate on an Erasmus exchange in autumn 2014. The international aspect of studies would need enhancing in future, as this would provide the students with more transferrable general skills that they expect, and generally strengthen KU's profile in Literary Science. One aspect of this is the students' language skills in foreign languages, which is a requirement of international exchanges.

In the section on student support (2.5.3), the academic advisors are not mentioned. The academic means of support for the students are quite formal) - information through a departmental information session, e-mail and notice boards; the set individual consultation times, then, seem less formal (#68). It is not apparent whether this practice meets the needs of the students. The social, psychological, and cultural support seems satisfactory, although some of the details do not seem to concern the current evaluation period (see #71 where the details are from 2007–2010).

Ethical issues are described elsewhere in the document but there is no indication of how the students are supported in academic code of practice, except that the Dispute Settlement Committee is mentioned (#73). A clear and easily accessible method for the students to clear their work for plagiarism would be a proactive way to assure the quality of learning outcomes.

The system of student assessment seems clear and adequate. The variation of methods, the transparency of the process and the systematic application of feedback seem to suggest that the assessment is of good quality, and supports the students' learning process (#77–#80, #93). Special attention is paid to the MA thesis (#81). The method of thesis assessment is valid as such but the constitution of the process is not fully explicated. During the visit it was found out that students are acquainted with the evaluation system. However, students had expressed that sometimes teachers base the evaluation on the personal attitude rather than on their knowledge.

The MA programme in Literary Science seems to provide the students with good skills that are in demand in the society (2.5.5, #83). Due to the small number of graduates, the examples of employers are necessarily quite individual and random, but nevertheless indicative of the wide applicability of the acquired skills and knowledge. Developing the visibility in course descriptions of the general skills acquired through studies in Literary Science would further help the employment of students in jobs that correspond with their level of expertise. This, together with emphasis on good employability might offer a way to attract more applicants.

The transfer into the third cycle doctoral studies is not clearly described in the SER. It appears that 10 % of the graduates continue for a PhD (#83), and this route should be more clearly documented, especially if the department aims to increase the number of doctoral candidates, and perhaps encourage people from other universities to pursue doctoral studies in the joint programme KU participates in.

2.6. Programme management

Programme management seems to be the weakest element in the programme, even though the responsibilities for the decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated in the structure of the university's line organization (#84–#86). The role of the Student Union or the social shareholders is not clarified, and their connection to the Study Quality Committee is not mentioned (#85). Overall, the system is structurally clear but the functioning of it is not evident from the documentation, and was not clarified during the visit.

The information and data about the implementation of the programme are collected and analysed systematically but the rotation cycle is not indicated (#88, #92). This information has been made public on the KU website since 2012, which is a good practice. It is mentioned that the full-time students have access to participation in the management of the study process but apart from the Faculty Council and Study Programme Committee, it is not declared whether students use this opportunity or how many of them are involved (#89).

The outcomes of internal evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme (#87, #92). Student participation in the development of the programme is vital, as they are the immediate stakeholders, and the students indicated that their possibilities to influence are good. Attention is paid also to ethical issues (#95), which is a significant indicator of quality work, and should be continued.

The implementation of the recommendations from the previous external evaluation is reported at the end of the SER (p. 30), but for the most part very vaguely ("were decreased", "was revised", "became stricter"). The recommendation for increasing the use of the Internet for further publicizing the programme appears not to have been implemented (recommendation #6; cf. #94).

The evaluation and improvement processes involve social stakeholders in a very informal way, although it also includes some kind of collaboration agreements (#90). The role and involvement of the stakeholders could and should be stronger, and the formal structures should encourage this. And example of this is that the SER was written by the teachers, and the role of the student representative in the SER group) - namely responsible for student employment) - was not clarified. During the site visit of the authorial team for this report it was explained that there was a major event on the same day that prevented major social partners from meeting the team. This is reasonable, yet it remains a weakness of this programme that it does not have clear social partners with whom KU works for the promotion of the programme, for placing in-business praxis, and for expanding student recruitment efforts.

The internal quality assurance measures seem to be effective as the department actively seeks data for improvement (#87). There is inadequate data as to estimate the efficiency of these measures, especially as student motivation is reported to have decreased (#96). High level of staff competence is mentioned as a principal factor in quality assurance (#91), and efforts are made to maintain it. This could also be used as an element in attracting prospective students and doctoral candidates.

There seems also to be a discrepancy between staff and student expectations of the programme. During the meetings in Klaipeda, staff responsible for the preparation of the SER and teaching staff mentioned that the students who graduate will become researchers of Prussian Lithuania history, culture and languages, while the students stated that after they graduate they anticipate becoming school teachers or to work in local cultural institutions. This indicates that teaching staff and students understand the goals of the programme differently, which indicates that there is inadequate dialogue between staff and students about the end results of the programme.

2.7. Examples of excellence *
* if there are any to be shared as a good practice

There have been no particular good examples of excellence in this study programme.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The current MA study Programme in Literature Science needs to be re-defined and re-designed in order to attract any students interested to preserve the core of the actual curriculum but more as a special interest of research within a larger and broader context of Baltic Sea Area countries that can accommodate a variety of needs, both of prospective students and of academic staff determined to retain its interest in preserving the cultural heritage and its literature as a special niche of either Cultural studies (that may include history, archaeology, music, etc.) or more comprehensive studies of Comparative Literature, where BA graduates of Lithuanian, English, German, or other foreign languages can be the real target group for the programme. Suggestions by KU management as expressed during the visit that the way out of the impasse is to join the current MA programme in Literature Science with Theatre studies will probably not give viable results, since it is, again, too limited and exclusive to attract enough students in order to have this modification seen as the solution to the situation where there are no students, and, consequently, no living programme.

2. KU must invest more funds, expertise and energy to create a highly interesting and comprehensive programme that will be attractive not only to a handful of KU BA graduates, but to other students from Lithuania, and, possibly, to some international students. It means that the staff must become exposed to new trends in literary studies, and to work closely with fellow academics from the Baltic Sea Area countries interested in similar aspects of specialised competences related to preserving and developing the issues of identity and cultural heritage through international perspectives.

3. A recruitment strategy for attracting new students is crucial. This should be a formal undertaking of the programme staff and management, and should be developed in close coordination with the current students, graduates, social partners, and potential employers.

4. It should be a priority of the programme staff and management to expand elective offerings, particularly to broaden the general 'core' offerings of Prussian Lithuanian culture to include wider regional courses, cultural studies, historical or anthropological courses, and wider comparative literature offerings. Students have also expressed interest in further writing courses, such as creative writing, or expanded academic writing offerings.

IV. SUMMARY

In summary, it must be noted that this programme is in a perilous situation. As noted above, the decline in student numbers resulted in no admissions for the academic year 2014-2015, and the previous enrolments do not appear to have been highly selective.

The programme has elements that are positive and deserve support. The staff are clearly skilled and determined specialists whose work and research seem supportive of the main aims of the programme. It is also to be noted that the programme seeks to have a social value unusual in literary studies programmes; it aims to preserve, study, and promote local culture. Done properly, and with appropriate resources, this should produce skilled graduates who can contribute both with their scholarship and teaching, if they continue to pursue academic studies of Lithuanian literature, or with their general work, should they choose to leave academia.

The programme, however, has several major flaws that should be addressed. Student enrolments are crucial; if another year results in no new enrolments, the programme will *de facto* disappear as a viable study option on MA level. It is difficult to perceive how the programme could emerge from two years of zero enrolment, as that would be an essentially terminal circumstance. As noted above, it is a recommendation of this team that the programme seek external (guest) lecturers, perhaps on term-long mobility programmes, to provide expanded 'elective' offerings, particularly in the English language. The staff are also encouraged to determine how to promote a specialist term of Lithuanian literary studies that might attract incoming student mobility; offering lectures on Lithuanian and Prussian Lithuanian literature and culture in English or German would make this possible. A broader range of elective offerings, particularly those that might incorporate elements of history, cultural studies, or archaeology, would usefully expand the intellectual range of the programme. Finally, it is strongly advisable that KU builds direct and complimentary relations with a broader range of social partners for this programme, in order to increase student in-business praxis and greater programme visibility in the community.

The team feels that programme management is the weakest area considered by this report, and accounts for troubles detected in other areas of this paper. It must be made clear to the programme management and staff that previous recommendations do not seem to have been pursued carefully; that social partners seem to be few; that the programme appears run on a 'top-down' approach, and finally that there are simply no new students. The team did not feel that the

programme management deserved an eliminatory point, as the current staff and management are capable, skilled people who can, by following the recommendations contained in this report, oversee a successful reorientation of this programme and increased student numbers. Yet it must be noted that effective action should engage the management, staff, students, and graduates in collaborative efforts to implement the suggestions of this report.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Literary Science* (state code – 621Q20005) at Klaipėda University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	2
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	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: Andrew Goodspeed

Grupės nariai:
Team members: Srebren Dizdar

                      Joel Kuortti

                      Gintaras Bleizgys

                      Alisa Stunžaitė

Vertimas iš anglų kalbos

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Dabartinę Literatūrologijos magistrantūros studijų programą reikia apibrėžti iš naujo ir perkurti, siekiant pritraukti studentų, suinteresuotų studijuoti pagrindinius dabartinio studijų turinio dalykus, tačiau labiau domintis moksliniais tyrimais didesniame ir platesniame Baltijos regiono šalių kontekste. Tai reikia daryti tenkinant įvairius poreikius – tiek būsimų studentų, tiek dėstytojų, pasiryžusių išlaikyti susidomėjimą kultūros paveldo ir literatūros išsaugojimu kaip specialią kultūros studijų (galinčių apimti istoriją, archeologiją, muziką ir pan.) nišą arba kaip visapusiškesnes lyginamosios literatūros studijas, kurių tikslinė grupė – lietuvių, anglų, vokiečių ar kitų užsienio kalbų bakalaurai. Per vizitą KU vadovybės išreikšti pasiūlymai dėl šios padėties be išeities sprendimo – sujungti dabartinę Literatūrologijos magistrantūros studijų programą su Teatrologijos studijų programa – greičiausiai neduos rezultatų, nes pastaroji programa taip pat pernelyg ribota ir išskirtinė, kad pritrauktų pakankamai studentų, tad sunku tikėtis, kad toks pakeitimas išspręstų situaciją, kai nėra studentų, taigi – ir gyvybingos programos.

2. KU turi investuoti daugiau lėšų, profesionalumo ir energijos, norėdamas sukurti tikrai įdomią ir visapusišką programą, kuri būtų patraukli ne tik saujelei KU bakalauro studijų absolventų, bet ir kitiems Lietuvos ir galbūt užsienio studentams. Tai reiškia, kad personalas turi būti atviras literatūrologijos srities naujovėms ir glaudžiai bendradarbiauti su kolegomis iš Baltijos regiono šalių, besidomintiems panašiais specializuotų gebėjimų aspektais, susijusiais su tapatybės ir kultūros paveldo išsaugojimu ir puoselėjimu tarptautiniu požiūriu.

3. Ypač svarbu – naujų studentų pritraukimo strategija. Tai turėtų būti oficialus programos dėstytojų ir vadovybės uždavinys; ją rengiant reikėtų glaudžiai bendradarbiauti su dabartiniais studentais, absolventais, socialiniais partneriais ir potencialiais darbdaviais.

4. Programos dėstytojai ir vadovybė turėtų nustatyti prioritetą išplėsti pasirenkamųjų dalykų sąrašą, ypač – išplėsti bendruosius studijų pagrindų Mažosios Lietuvos kultūros dalykus, įtraukiant platesnius regionų studijų dalykus, kultūros studijas, istorijos ir antropologijos dalykus ir platesnius lyginamosios literatūros dalykus. Studentai taip pat išreiškė susidomėjimą papildomais rašymo, pvz., kūrybinio rašymo, kursais arba platesniais akademinio rašymo dalykais.

IV. SANTRAUKA

Apibendrinant pažymėtina, kad ši studijų programa atsidūrė pavojingoje padėtyje. Kaip jau minėta, studentų skaičius mažėjo, galop 2014–2015 mokslo metais nebuvo priimta nė vieno studento. Didelės atrankos nerodo ir ankstesnių priėmimų duomenys.

Tačiau programa turi teigiamų aspektų, už juos reikėtų pagirti. Personalą sudaro kvalifikuoti ir ryžtingi specialistai, kurių darbas ir tyrimai padeda įgyvendinti pagrindinius programos tikslus. Taip pat reikėtų pažymėti, kad programa siekiama literatūrologijos programoms neįprastos socialinės vertės – išsaugoti, tyrinėti ir skatinti vietos kultūrą. Programą tinkamai vykdant ir turint tinkamus išteklius galima parengti kvalifikuotus absolventus, galinčius prisidėti tiek savo moksline veikla ir dėstymu, jei jie tęs akademines lietuvių literatūros studijas, tiek savo darbais, jei jie paliks akademinę bendruomenę.

Vis dėlto programa turi keletą didelių trūkumų, kuriuos reikėtų pašalinti. Studentų priėmimas yra esminis dalykas; jei ir kitais metais nebus priimta nė vieno studento, programa, kaip perspektyvi magistrantūros studijų pasirinkimo galimybė, *de facto* išnyks. Sunku suvokti, kaip programa galėtų būti atgaivinta po dvejų metų, kuriais nepriimta nė vieno studento, nes ši aplinkybė iš tiesų reikštų programos pabaigą. Kaip minėta, ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja ieškoti kviestinių dėstytojų (galbūt pagal semestro trukmės judumo programas), kurie galėtų dėstyti platesnius pasirenkamuosius dalykus, ypač anglų kalba. Personalas taip pat raginamas nuspręsti, kaip reklamuoti specialų lietuvių literatūrologijos semestrą, kad padidintų atvykstamąjį studentų judumą; to galima pasiekti siūlant paskaitas apie Lietuvos ir Mažosios Lietuvos literatūrą ir kultūrą anglų ar vokiečių kalba. Didesnis pasirenkamųjų dalykų pasirinkimas, ypač įtraukiant istorijos, kultūrologijos ar archeologijos aspektus, išplėstų programos intelektinį diapazoną. Galiausiai labai rekomenduojama KU užmegzti tiesioginius ir papildomus ryšius su platesniu šios programos socialinių partnerių ratu, siekiant didesnių studentų praktikos įmonėse galimybių ir didesnio programos matomumo bendruomenėje.

Ekspertų grupės nuomone, programos vadyba yra silpniausias aspektas, nagrinėjamas išvadose, jis lėmė ir kitose vertinamose srityse nustatytus trūkumus. Programos vadovybė ir personalas turėtų aiškiai suprasti, kad ne iki galo įgyvendino ankstesnes rekomendacijas; socialinių partnerių skaičius labai mažas; programa vykdoma pagal principą „iš viršaus į apačią"; galiausiai nėra naujų studentų. Ekspertų grupė nemano, kad programos vadyba nusipelno nepatenkinamo

įvertinimo, nes dabartinį personalą ir vadovybę sudaro gabūs ir kvalifikuoti darbuotojai, kurie, remdamiesi šiose išvadose pateiktomis rekomendacijomis, gali sėkmingai perorientuoti studijų programą ir padidinti studentų skaičių. Tačiau reikėtų pažymėti, kad vadovybė, personalas, studentai ir absolventai turėtų suvienyti pastangas ir imtis veiksmingų priemonių, siekdami įgyvendinti šiose išvadose pateiktus pasiūlymus.