



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Klaipėdos universitetas

***SOCIALINĖS EKONOMINĖS GEOGRAFIJOS IR
REGIONISTIKOS PROGRAMOS (612L70001)***

VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

**EVALUATION REPORT
OF *SOCIAL ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY AND REGIONAL
STUDIES (612L70001)***

STUDY PROGRAMME

At Klaipėda University

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader: Prof. Geoffrey Robinson

Grupės nariai:
Team members: Prof. dr. Bjørn Asheim
Prof. dr. Tommi Inkinen
Rytas Šalna
Inga Bačelytė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Socialinė ekonominė geografija ir regionistika</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612L70001
Studijų sritis	socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	visuomeninė geografija
Studijų programos rūšis	universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	nuolatinės (3,5), iššęstinės (4,5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	210 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	visuomeninės geografijos bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1997 m. gegužės 19 d.

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Social Economic Geography and Regional Studies</i>
State code	612L70001
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Human Geography
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First cycle
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (3,5), part-time (4,5)
Volume of the study programme in credits	210 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Human Geography
Date of registration of the study programme	19 May 1997

© 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	6
3. Staff	6
5. Study process and student assessment.....	8
6. Programme management	10
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	10
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	12

I. INTRODUCTION

The external evaluation of the Bachelor study programme in *Social Economic Geography and Regional Studies* at Klaipėda University (hereafter, 'the University') was initiated by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education of Lithuania nominating the international expert group (hereafter, the 'expert group' or 'evaluation panel') formed by Professor Geoffrey Robinson (lately of the University of St. Andrews, Scotland – team leader), Professor Bjørn Asheim (University of Lund, Sweden), Professor Tommi Inkinen (University of Helsinki, Finland), Rytas Šalna (President of the Lithuanian Association of Geography Teachers) and Inga Bačelytė (final-year Bachelor student, Vilnius University).

The evaluation of the study programme ('the programme') made use of the following documents: Law on Higher Education and Research of the Republic of Lithuania (2009); Procedure of the External Evaluation and Accreditation of Study Programmes (2009); Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes (2010); and General Requirements of First Degree and Integrated Study Programmes (2010).

The basis for the evaluation of the study programme is the Self-Evaluation Report (SER), written in 2013, its annexes and the site visit of the expert group to the University on 17 December 2013. The Department of Social Geography ('the Department'), located in the Faculty of Social Sciences ('the Faculty'), is directly responsible for the programme, overseeing its delivery and monitoring. The site visit incorporated all required meetings with different groups: the administrative staff of the Faculty, staff responsible for preparing the self-evaluation documents, teaching staff, students of all years of study, graduates, and employers. The expert group inspected support facilities and resources (classrooms, laboratories, library, computer facilities), scrutinised students' final works, and various other materials.

After discussions and preparations of conclusions and remarks, the expert group presented introductory general conclusions of the visit to the Department's staff. The group subsequently met to discuss and agree the content of the report, which represents the members' consensual views.

Both the evaluated Bachelor and Master programmes are located in the same Department within the same Faculty. They share the same facilities; the same departmental staff contribute to both programmes, albeit with different loadings and with the addition in the Master programme of specialist teachers from other departments; administration and management are essentially the same for both programmes; and employers who met with the evaluation group related to both programmes and interacted at Department and Faculty levels. The site visit covered both programmes simultaneously and, inevitably, the two evaluation reports have much in common.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme aims and learning outcomes, detailed in the SER, are well defined, clear and publicly accessible in a variety of open information sources. The stated overall aim is to train specialists of human geography able to investigate, analyze, manage, and model social-economic problems of the society and economy, to identify the spatial causes of the problems, and to apply the principles of sustainable development to their solutions; to train specialists of regional development. Sixteen specific intended learning outcomes are outlined in five groups (knowledge and its applications, research abilities, special abilities, social abilities and personal abilities). These include both quantitative and qualitative requirements with emphasis on the importance of critical academic thinking. Every course is built around a selection of those

learning outcomes, the whole designed to further the programme's four priorities, which in addition to satisfying local and regional employment and development needs include ensuring international mobility for students and graduates. Overall, the expert group considers the outlined priorities to be quite broad but adequate to summarise the general mission of the programme. The goals are supportable and correspond to normal expectations of BA education.

The expert group did note that stated learning outcomes are very ambitious for some courses. For example, Socio-Economic Geography Theory and Research Methods has eight intended learning outcomes: these include using GIS and SPSS, being able to analyse human resource problems, knowing analytical and research methods and being able to analyse various sources of information and databases. Such expectations of achieving these learning outcomes are very optimistic, even allowing that eight ECTS credits are allocated to the course. The learning outcomes were formulated, however, only in the autumn semester of 2012. There is scope, therefore, for the Department in its ongoing monitoring of the programme to revise expectations of all courses in the light of students' actual achievements.

The programme is driven by professional employment concerns rather than by research. Specific priorities stress the importance of breadth in education with a labour-market focus and acquisition of a sufficient knowledge base to support further studies or life-long learning. Graduates report positively about the programme and reinforce the view that there is a market for graduates with skills in regional studies. The SER's Table 1 (page 12) identifies labour market condition as one of the strengths of the programme. Employers supported this view in their meeting with the expert group.

The meeting with students, however, revealed some confusion among them about the need for and logic behind some offered courses. The evaluation panel was left with the distinct impression that students were not fully cognisant of the relationship between the intended learning outcomes and the content of courses, despite the fact that the information is widely and readily available to them in programme documentation. In their scrutiny of the final theses, as evidence of achieved outcomes, the evaluation panel was clear that the produced theses were descriptive and their analytical basis could be much stronger in terms of international references, analytical quality and presentation. Nevertheless, the panel agreed that the quality of the theses, and hence students' achievements of intended learning outcomes had improved since the last evaluation, indicating the programme's development is on a rising trajectory.

Meetings with both employers and alumni revealed they were satisfied with the personal learning results and skills together with employment competence. Both stakeholder groups stressed the importance of management skills and other knowledge sources such as basic knowledge of contracts and law, areas that the programme managers might consider in strengthening students' preparation for administrative roles. The expert group was concerned that the study goals and aims of the bachelor and master programmes are still quite similar, even though the programmes have gained more individuality since the previous evaluation. It may simply be that much of the text is identical in the SERs of both programmes but it was also noted that the staff could not account for the difference in the bachelor and master level programme names to the evaluation panel.

The BA programme changed its name from *Human Geography* to *Social Economic Geography and Regional Studies* in January 2013. The change was to a name that better suggested the programme's scope and was better understood by potential applicants. At the same time the programme decreased its study credits from 240 to 210, still complying with legal requirements. Both changes were aimed at attracting more students and some success is indicated by a reversal in 2013 of the sharp fall in recruitment over the previous two years. But now the naming of BA and MA programmes is problematic, in that *Human Geography* is commonly understood as the meta-concept and *Social [and] Economic Geography* as subsections of human geography. The evaluation panel recommends reconsidering the naming of both programmes. They could

possibly have the same title but one option would be to name the BA programme Social and Economic Geography, even though these are two separate branches within the study field of Human Geography, and to name the MA programme *Social and Economic Geography and Regional Studies*. This should make it easier to distinguish between the programmes and also allow an increased specialisation towards topics of specific relevance for Lithuania generally and the region specifically.

2. Curriculum design

Beginning in the autumn of 2013, the programme now extends over seven semesters rather than the previous eight. This is reflected in the reduction to 210 credits, the minimum legal requirement for first-level programmes. Students had been involved in the moves for and planning of this change and fully approved of it.

The programme design accords with the University's regulations and national legislation. Since the previous evaluation the programme designers have introduced a number of new courses and updated others. The subject areas are clearly distinct from each other. The structural organization of courses is logical and also provides freedom to select special subjects within Human Geography in advanced courses. The study content and student workload are spread evenly within the timetable. The courses are not repetitive and are broad and extensive in content, consistent with the level of bachelor studies. The subject contents are consistent with the study levels as far as can be seen from the course descriptions and are designed to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

The programme clearly presents the diversity of Human Geography and includes courses whose titles reflect the latest achievements in science. The publications cited for students, however, indicate that the programme's scientific content still relies extensively on national publications, focusing on the local and national at the expense of international issues. The previous evaluation panel encouraged the referencing of international publications in courses and more staff interaction with the international geographical community. The present staff acknowledge that an increase of teacher and student international exchanges would aid the inclusion of more international science in the programme. In their meeting with the evaluation panel, however, the staff claimed that they lacked information on how to make the programme more international in its nature and standards.

The expert group was pleased with the improvements that had been made since the previous evaluation, especially in the increased practical content and methodological teaching in the programme. For example, they strongly approve of the inclusion of professional skills courses such as "professional speech" (2nd semester); presentation skills and social capability are important elements of bachelor graduate skills today. An optional course "ethnogeography" is a welcome addition focusing on qualitative issues in human geography. There remains room for further enhancement of methodological teaching, however. For example, a course dedicated to qualitative methods is recommended, possibly for the BA and certainly for the MA programme.

3. Staff

The SER provides details of the qualifications and experience of all the programme staff. The senior staff members hold PhD degrees and have extensive teaching experience. They comfortably meet the legal requirements and their number is more than adequate to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

The number of teaching staff has increased since the previous evaluation. The SER indicates that there are 31 full-time and part-time teachers and the total number of courses is 50 (p. 15). This is now a more reasonable number and appears to have had a positive effect on the time available for staff to allocate to research. There were contradictory views expressed to the expert group,

however, by members of staff regarding their workloads. Some claimed increased workloads whereas others accepted they had reduced.

Staff turnover is well managed and the running of the programme in respect of staff continuity appears to be sustainable. The University offers programmes to support staff in developing their professional skills. Teachers have adapted their teaching methods to incorporate the use of discussions, debates, the Moodle system, visualizations and other innovations in their classes. Students greatly appreciate these developments. It is a concern, however, that at present, doctoral degree studies are unavailable in Human Geography in Lithuania. There is no doubt that PhD qualifications in that subject field, as opposed to Physical Geography (where new PhD programmes are also not to be developed), following on from 1st. and 2nd. cycle studies, would greatly improve the academic integrity (and national reputation) of the subject and have a positive impact on its future teaching. Some staff members have visited abroad, collaborate in international projects and can inject their knowledge of an international context into their teaching. In this regard, it is laudable that the Faculty offers some financial support to participate in international conferences and research activities. Most of the staff, however, are limited in the orientation of their teaching and research to regional or national issues. Moreover, the international visibility of the research is very limited. Most of the work is published in Lithuanian and in publications that do not have an impact on the scientific community outside Lithuania. This limited research activity shows also in the curriculum design.

The evaluation panel saw an improvement in international teacher exchanges since the previous evaluation. Although the number of outbound teachers from the Department remained constant at two over the two-year elapsed period (SER Table 5), the number of inbound teachers increased from one to five in 2012-13. Their impact is selective through particular courses, but the participation of foreign teachers in the programme does help to motivate students to consider international dimensions of their studies. Nevertheless, there is still scope for considerable enhancement of the programme's internationalism through the staffs' activities. Again, there has been improvement since the last evaluation. For example, an international seminar is held annually on the themes of social geography, research methodology, and regional studies; these lead to published articles, some of them, as with other staff publications, appearing in foreign periodicals. Together with 12 partners from Lithuania, Russia, and Poland, the Department was awarded an international project under the Lithuania-Poland-Russia Cross-Border Co-operation Programme (2007-2013) – *Lagoons as Crossroads for Interaction between Peoples and Tourism in the South-East Baltic Region: from History to Present (CROSSROADS 2)*. The Department received a grant of €112,000 for the implementation of activities, which has played a big part in funding some of the improvements in the Department's material resources.

It is evident that the international outlook, with some exceptions, focuses largely on neighbouring countries such as Poland and other Baltic countries. The panel therefore strongly encourages the staff to seek additional possibilities for international research collaboration on a more extensive European and global scale. For example, there are no identified contacts in the USA or Asia. A related obstacle to enhancing the international dimensions of the Department's two programmes is the strong orientation to publishing only in the Lithuanian language. This is perfectly understandable but the expert group does recommend committing to publishing in English and participating in international research networks such as IGU (International Geographical Union), RSA (Regional Studies Association) and AAG (Association of American Geographers). This cannot happen in the short term – it will require a systematic widening of outlook and the securing of considerable financial support – but it would ultimately help the staff's publication and research profile and hence feed into the programme's international content.

4. Facilities and learning resources

The available lecture theatres, seminar rooms, computing laboratories and libraries, with adequate space, seating and Wi-Fi connectivity continue to provide a good setting in which to deliver much of the programme. Nevertheless, the Department seeks to improve the main lecture theatre for geography teaching and to that end has already purchased new furniture and installed new audio-visual equipment for lectures. But the material resources available to the programme were severely criticised in the report of the last evaluation. It is to the Department's credit and indeed that of the University and the Faculty that considerable steps have been taken and funding secured, in such a short time, to achieve substantial improvements in the facilities and equipment available to the programme.

EU projects have provided devolved funding to improve the facilities. The classrooms used for the studies of "Geographic Research Methods" and "GIS Studies" have been adjusted to specialised use. All the classrooms have computer equipment and internet access, supplemented with effective Wi-Fi connectivity throughout the Faculty building. The University has an extensive range of software licences and the Department has secured an adequate provision of computing and related technical equipment, including the ArcGIS 10.1 software, to satisfy the needs of staff for preparation and delivery of the courses, as well as having unlimited access for staff and students to ArcGIS 9.3. Other material resources have also seen improvements. These include an upgrading of the stock of maps and atlases. The continuing enrichment of learning resources related to studies of general cartography and GIS had already begun before the last evaluation, and the latest teaching literature for theory studies and practical assignments has been acquired.

The University and Faculty libraries have significantly improved their provision in terms of available books, databases and periodicals as more funds have been made available. The SERs do not separately identify the library provision for the two programmes but, for example, the Department is able to obtain approximately 152 printed books annually for students, a much better provision than at the time of the previous evaluation. The librarians acknowledge that the overall stock of traditional book resources is rather low but are trying to redress the situation by increasing the acquisition of e-books. The University library provides access to leading publishing houses and academic databases. As yet, however, there are few references to the various electronic media in students' theses, despite the collaboration of the Department with the University library in organising courses and workshops to develop students' competence in making best use of the available resources. References to international literature are also very limited, despite the international content of many bibliographies and even allowing that the programme's recent acquisitions listed in the SER's Appendices 6 and 7 have a poor international presence. Clearly there is still more work to be done in encouraging both staff and students to avail themselves of the full range of literature resources relevant to their courses.

5. Study process and student assessment

Admission requirements are well founded and clearly explained with regard to the competitive scores required to gain admission. The target score for admission to part-time studies has historically been set higher than for full-time and numbers of qualified applicants have been too few to warrant running part-time studies since 2009.

Recent entrants to the programme have scores considerably higher than the minimum requirement. Since the evaluation in 2011, recruitment of students fell sharply over the following two years, from a peak of 31 in 2010, to 16 in 2011 and nine in 2012. This situation prompted the programme revisions referred to in the section on *Programme aims and learning outcomes* above. The 2013 intake of 25 is an indication that the changes are having the desired effect. Current later-year students and recent graduates consider the programme to be greatly improved. The securing of state-funded places, the vouchers awarded to high-scoring students and which they bring to the programme, is a factor in the make up of the student intake. Only one entrant

was state funded in this way in 2011-12, one in 2012-13 and four in 2013-14. Most students fund their own studies and many of them are simultaneously in employment. The Department is coping well with the challenges presented by such a student body.

The organisation of the study process, in terms of lecture, seminar and examination schedules, supports the programme aims and enables an adequate acquisition of knowledge and skills in achieving the stated learning outcomes. The timetables harmonise as far as possible with students' employment commitments and, in response to student feedback, the Department is considering the concentrated bloc teaching of some courses to cater still better to the employed students' needs without compromising the programme's integrity. There are good academic and social support systems, as outlined in the SER, including psychological help and sports clubs within the Faculty. Limited additional funding is available for students with special needs and there are incentive grants for students who achieve a very good or excellent academic record. In actuality, few have been awarded to students in the Department and the grants appear not to be providing their intended stimulus. This is perhaps a matter to be reviewed by the Faculty.

All necessary information is made reliably and readily available to students in a variety of ways. The students voiced no complaints to the expert group about the information provided to them and this is confirmed by their course-questionnaire responses. Particularly good practice was illustrated by the growing numbers of staff members providing all relevant information at the beginning of a course and reviewing at the end of the course what had actually happened. This information includes the stated aims and intended learning outcomes of the course but it was clear from the meeting with the evaluation panel that this terminology was unfamiliar to the students.

The proportion of students graduating from the programme is excellent, amounting to almost 100 per cent (SER Table 14). The number of dropouts is low and graduates secure work in a variety of employment areas. It is clear from the meeting with employers and alumni that the programme is producing highly employable graduates in the targeted labour market of local, regional and national development agencies. Graduates' ability to work with GIS and utilise analytical skills are valued but administrative skills and strategic thinking were identified as qualities that could be better developed.

Students are encouraged to carry out research activities and 12 from the Department are involved in the abovementioned CROSSROADS project. The Faculty demonstrates good practice in holding an annual international conference where students can present their work. Some also participate in projects with staff members, where they can improve their theoretical knowledge and research skills. All benefit from the distant field practices that are hosted each year by a university in a neighbouring foreign country. It is to the University's credit that students are fully funded to attend such practices. Other, more specialised practice is in the form of internships in the autumn semester of the 4th year in a variety of enterprises, organisations and agencies, the programme's social partners, who confirmed to the expert group the value of these placements – both to employer and student.

The study programme is involved in the Erasmus exchange programme. The extent of international mobility is well documented in the SER, showing that between one and five students each year participate in the programme, with others coming from abroad. Alumni gave examples of exchange visits to Romania and Turkey. The evaluation panel encourages the Department to stimulate even more of such exchanges, in the interest of bringing still more international experience into the programme.

Student assessment is by a wide range of methods. The regime and the marking criteria are well documented and students were content with the assessment methods and their fairness, as reported to the evaluation panel and demonstrated by the results from regular feedback surveys. At the previous evaluation, the expert group had urged a critical review of the final thesis and this element of the programme still warrants attention. The level of analysis and standard of

presentation have certainly improved, although qualitative analysis is still lacking. The theses still contain few international references, countering observations that the limited library holding of books is compensated by Internet access to journals. The resources might be there but the students are not making good use of them.

6. Programme management

The SER clearly presents the system and responsibilities for decision making and management of the programme. The University's internal quality assurance system appears to be working well. Each of the three management levels, Department, Faculty and University, has clearly assigned roles in periodic review and monitoring processes. And a mark of the effectiveness of the management system is the achievement in making so many successful changes and improvements to the programme in only two years since the last external evaluation. The SER lists nine major changes in response to the 2011 evaluation, many of them already mentioned elsewhere in this report. The current panel was impressed by the efforts that had been made and especially by the sense of ownership of the improved programme conveyed by all parties in the various meetings.

The internal evaluation and improvement processes engage representatives of all stakeholders. Management information is collected and analysed adequately at several levels of administration. Of great help for programme improvement are regular surveys of students' opinions about the quality of studies and the objectivity of assessments. The results are disseminated within the programme and are additional to the continuing feedback that emanates from the classroom interactions of students and staff. Employers who met with the assessment panel were content that their informal and continuing contacts with programme staff had influenced and continue to influence programme developments. They welcome their representation on the programme committee but would still welcome the opportunity for a more formal wider engagement with the programme, perhaps in a round-table format on a regular, possibly annual basis. Both students and staff were particularly keen to express how the staff are willing to listen to and adopt suggestions. They cited the reduction in the length of the programme and changes in the length of internships as two examples of student suggestions that had been implemented.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Make a sound academic case to change the programme names so as to convey their scope better and submit it to the relevant legislative body; and continue to review the aims and intended learning outcomes of the Department's two programmes so as to reinforce their distinctiveness.
2. In the review of intended learning outcomes, revise those that are deemed too ambitious in some courses by comparison with the learning outcomes actually achieved.
3. Increase the international content of the programme, for example by constantly upgrading the course reading lists and including more journal articles from leading foreign publications.
4. Include more qualitative methodology in the courses.
5. Further encourage the growth of the staff's international activities. Currently the programme's international dimension largely comprises staff and student visits and individual projects that commonly involve neighbouring countries. (The CROSSROADS project is a notable and valuable exception to the individuality of projects.) The international perspective could be broadened more to include Western Europe and North America and could extend to publishing more in leading international journals. This recommendation is not to deny the importance of studying and addressing Lithuanian issues. But bringing to bear on them aspects of the accumulated scholarship and

methodological developments in the international geographical community would enhance Lithuanian studies and, reciprocally, would bring Lithuanian work more prominently into that arena.

6. Continue the improvement in material resources, especially by expanding the representation of international publications.
7. Address the remaining weaknesses in final-year theses, especially by requiring more references to foreign literature sources and better analytical content.
8. Strengthen still further the stakeholder input to programme planning, perhaps by instituting an appropriately timed annual round-table exchange of views and information with programme staff.

IV. SUMMARY

Programme aims and learning outcomes: *Strengths* – well-defined aims and mainly achievable intended learning outcomes, albeit those in a few courses appear very ambitious; the programme aims are consistent with learning outcomes that are appropriate to the bachelor studies level and to the target labour market for graduates. *Weakness* – the naming of both BA and MA programmes is problematic and the individuality of the two programmes remains less clear than it should be.

Curriculum design: *Strengths* – the changes made to the curriculum, which both in length and revised courses have led to greater student satisfaction while preserving an acceptable coverage of the diversity and breadth of human geography; practical and methodological content has been improved, albeit qualitative analytical methods warrant more attention. *Weakness* - the paucity of international references in the courses, reflecting the need to grow the international dimensions of the programme.

Staff: *Strengths* – a well-qualified staff enthusiastic about the programme and who liaise well with the students in continuing to develop the programme. *Weakness* – despite some improvement since the previous evaluation, the international dimensions of teaching and research activities remain in need of enhancement.

Facilities and learning resources: *Strengths* – the considerable effort and financing that have gone into improving the facilities and resources to their present level where they much better provide for the needs of the programme. *Weakness* – although literature resources have grown, there is still room for considerable improvement in international representation.

Study process and student assessment: *Strengths* – organisation of the programme schedule to accommodate, as far as possible, the needs of a student body that is largely self funding and often in employment; the opportunities provided for student practice, including distant practice in neighbouring countries and internships (placements); opportunities for research work, especially in the CROSSROADS project. *Weaknesses* – poor use by both staff and students in the courses, including the final-year theses, of the available international literature resources. The final-year theses still feature a relatively low amount and quality of analytical content; they still closely follow the quantitative traditions within the subject and fail to embrace the more qualitative approaches that characterise much of modern human geography.

Programme management: *Strengths* – the good use made of the outcomes of external and internal evaluations to improve the programme; the achievement of so many positive changes to the programme since the previous external evaluation exemplifies the management's effectiveness. All levels of the planning and quality-assurance systems welcome and pay heed to students' opinions. There is now employer representation on the programme committee and staff maintain good contact with alumni and employers.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Social Economic Geography and Regional Studies* (state code – 612L70001) at Klaipėda University 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Staff	3
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)	4
	Total:	19

*1 (unsatisfactory) - there are essential shortcomings that must be eliminated;

2 (satisfactory) - meets the established minimum requirements, needs improvement;

3 (good) - the field develops systematically, has distinctive features;

4 (very good) - the field is exceptionally good.

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader: Prof. Geoffrey Robinson

Grupės nariai:
Team members: Prof. dr. Bjørn Asheim
Prof. dr. Tommi Inkinen
Rytas Šalna
Inga Bačelytė

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
SOCIALINĖ EKONOMINĖ GEOGRAFIJA IR REGIONISTIKA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS
– 612L70001) 2014-02-24 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-79 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Socialinė ekonominė geografija ir regionistika* (valstybinis kodas – 612L70001) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	4
	Iš viso:	19

* 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 numatomi studijų rezultatai. *Stiprybės:* apibrėžti tikslai ir iš esmės pasiekiami numatomi studijų rezultatai, nors kelių dalykų rezultatai yra labai ambicingi; programos tikslai dera su numatomais studijų rezultatais, kurie atitinka bakalauro studijų pakopos absolvento lygį ir tikslinės darbo rinkos poreikius. *Silpnybės:* ir bakalauro, ir magistro studijų programų pavadinimai abejotini, o abiejų programų savitumas vis dar ne toks aiškus, kaip turėtų būti.

Programos sandara. *Stiprybės:* programos pakeitimai, susiję su jos trukme ir patikslintais dalykais, dabar labiau tenkina studentus, nors kartu išsaugota priimtina visuomeninės geografijos įvairovė; patobulintas praktinis ir metodinis turinys, nors kokybiniais analitiniais metodams reikėtų skirti daugiau dėmesio. *Silpnybės:* dėstant dalykus mažai naudojamosi tarptautine informacija; tai reiškia, kad reikia stiprinti tarptautinį programos aspektą.

Personalas. *Stiprybės:* kvalifikuotas personalas, kuris su dideliu užsidegimu įgyvendina šią programą ir toliau ją tobulina palaikydamas ryšį su studentais. *Silpnybės:* nepaisant kai kurių

patobulinimų, atliktų po paskutinio įvertinimo, vis dar reikia stiprinti tarptautinį mokymo ir mokslo tiriamosios veiklos aspektą.

Materialieji ištekliai. *Stiprybės:* daug pastangų ir finansų įdėta į materialiujų išteklių pagerinimą iki dabartinio lygio, kuris daug geriau užtikrina šios programos poreikius. *Silpnybės:* nors literatūros išteklių padaugėjo, tarptautinių šaltinių galėtų būti ir daugiau.

Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas. *Stiprybės:* programos tvarkaraščio sudarymas kuo labiau atsižvelgiant į studentų, kurie daugiausia dirba ir patys moka už savo mokslą, poreikius; studentams suteiktos galimybės atlikti praktiką, įskaitant tolimąją praktiką kaimyninėse šalyse ir specialiąją praktiką; mokslinio darbo, ypač pagal projektą *Crossroads*, galimybės. *Silpnybės:* ir dėstytojai, ir studentai kursuose, taip pat ir rašydami baigiamuosius darbus, mažai naudojami prieinamais tarptautiniais literatūros šaltiniais. Baigiamieji darbai rodo, kad analitinės dalies apimtis vis dar palyginti maža ir neaukštos kokybės; juos rašant vis dar stipriai laikomasi kiekybinių tyrinėjamos temos apimties tradicijų, o ne šiuolaikinei visuomenės geografijai būdingo kokybinio požiūrio.

Programos vadyba. *Stiprybės:* programai patobulinti gerai pasinaudojama išorinio ir vidinio vertinimo išvadomis; tai, kad po ankstesnio išorinio vertinimo pasiekta tiek daug teigiamų programos pokyčių, patvirtina efektyvią vadybą. Visuose planavimo ir kokybės užtikrinimo lygmenyse paisoma studentų nuomonės. Šiuo metu programos komitete yra darbdavių atstovas, darbuotojai palaiko gerą ryšį su absolventais ir darbdaviais.

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Parengti ir atitinkamai sprendimus priimančiai institucijai pateikti akademiškai pagrįstą siūlymą keisti studijų programų pavadinimus, kad jie geriau atspindėtų programų apimtį, ir toliau tikslinti abiejų Socialinės geografijos katedros programų tikslus bei numatomus studijų rezultatus siekiant sustiprinti jų savitumą.
2. Atliekant numatomų studijų rezultatų peržiūrą tikslinti tuos su kai kuriais dalykais susijusius rezultatus, kurie laikomi pernelyg ambicingais, palyginant juos su iš tikrųjų pasiektais studijų rezultatais.
3. Stiprinti programos turinio tarptautiškumą, pavyzdžiui, nuolat atnaujinant dalykų literatūros sąrašus ir įtraukiant daugiau pagrindiniuose užsienio žurnaluose paskelbtų straipsnių.
4. Dalykų turinyje daugiau dėmesio turi būti skiriama kokybinei metodologijai.
5. Ir toliau skatinti darbuotojų tarptautinę veiklą. Šiuo metu programos tarptautinę dimensiją daugiausia sudaro personalo ir studentų vizitai, dažniausiai į kaimynines šalis, ir individualūs projektai, kuriuose paprastai dalyvauja kaimyninės valstybės (naudinga ir vertinga šių individualių projektų išimtis yra projektas *Crossroads*). Tarptautinę perspektyvą būtų galima labiau išplėsti į šią veiklą įtraukiant Vakarų Europą ir Šiaurės Ameriką ir daugiau straipsnių skelbiant pagrindiniuose tarptautiniuose žurnaluose. Šia rekomendacija nenorima sumenkinti Lietuvos problemų nagrinėjimo ir jų sprendimo svarbos. Bet jeigu jie būtų susieti su tarptautinės geografinės bendruomenės sukauptais mokslo ir metodologijos pasiekimais, tai paskatintų Lietuvos tyrinėjimus ir atitinkamai išryškintų Lietuvos pasiekimus šioje srityje.
6. Toliau gerinti materialiuosius išteklius, ypač didinant tarptautinių leidinių skaičių.
7. Šalinti su baigiamaisiais darbais susijusius trūkumus, ypač reikalaujant pateikti daugiau nuorodų į užsienio literatūros šaltinius ir stiprinti jų analitinę dalį.

8. Dar labiau didinti socialinių dalininkų indėlį į programos planavimo procesą, galbūt kasmet, tinkamu laiku organizuojant „apvalaus stalo“ susitikimus, kuriuose su programą įgyvendinančiais darbuotojais būtų keičiamasi nuomonėmis ir informacija.

<...>

Paslaugos teikėja patvirtina, jog yra susipažinusi su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso¹ 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)

¹ Žin., 2002, Nr.37-1341.