



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

**VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETO**  
**BIBLIOTEKŲ IR INFORMACIJOS CENTRŲ VADYBOS**  
**PROGRAMOS (62409S101/621P11001)**  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT**  
**OF MANAGEMENT OF LIBRARIES AND**  
**INFORMATIONAL CENTERS (62409S101/621P11001)**  
**STUDY PROGRAMME**  
**AT VILNIUS UNIVERSITY**

Grupės vadovas:  
Team Leader:

Prof. Richard John Hartley

Grupės nariai:  
Team members:

Andrew David Dawson

Assoc. Prof. Dorte Madsen

Prof. Gerrit Johannes van der Pijl

Emilija Banionytė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language - English

Vilnius  
2010

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Bibliotekų ir informacijos centrų vadyba</i>
Valstybinis kodas	62409S101 (naujas kodas - 621P11001)
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Informacijos paslaugos
Studijų programos rūšis	universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	nuolatinė (1,5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais <sup>1</sup>	60
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Bibliotekininkystės ir informacijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1997-05-19

<sup>1</sup> – vienas kreditas laikomas lygiu 40 studento darbo valandų

## INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme	<i>Libraries and Information Centers Management</i>
State code	62409S101 (new code - 621P11001)
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Information Services
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Level of studies	Master
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1,5 years)
Scope of the study programme in national credits	60
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Library and Information Studies
Date of registration of the study programme	19-05-1997

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

# CONTENTS

CONTENTS .....	3
I. INTRODUCTION .....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....	5
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes .....	5
1.1. Programme demand, purpose and aims .....	5
1.2. Learning outcomes of the programme .....	6
2. Curriculum design .....	6
2.1. Programme structure .....	6
2.2. Programme content .....	6
3. Staff .....	7
3.1. Staff composition and turnover .....	7
3.2. Staff competence .....	7
4. Facilities and learning resources .....	8
4.1. Facilities .....	8
4.2. Learning resources .....	8
5. Study process and student assessment .....	9
5.1. Student admission .....	9
5.2. Study process .....	9
5.3. Student support .....	10
5.4. Student achievement assessment .....	10
5.5. Graduates placement .....	11
6. Programme management .....	11
6.1. Programme administration .....	11
6.2. Internal quality assurance .....	12
III. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	13
IV. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....	14

## I. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the Lithuanian law on Higher Education and Research, dated 30 April 2009 (No XI-242), and in compliance with Order No. 1-94 of 30 October 2009, an Experts Team (here after: ET) appointed by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education has conducted an Evaluation of the study programme Management of Libraries and Information Centers (62409S101), Study Field of Communication and Information, Vilnius University.

In conducting their evaluation of the Study programme, the ET has applied the methodological guidelines developed by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education to implement provisions of the Order No. ISAK-1652 of 24 July 2009 of the Minister of Education and Science “On the approval of the description of the procedure for the external assessment and accreditation of study programmes” (Official Gazette, 2009, No. 96-4083), following the Law on Science and Studies of the Republic of Lithuania (Official Gazette, 2009, No. 54-2140).

The ET would like to pay tribute to the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education in Lithuania and, most especially to the Deputy Director of the Centre and to the Head of the Division for Studies Assessment, for the support given to the ET before and throughout the visit to Lithuania.

The External Assessment was conducted in the period November 2010 with in-country evaluation taking place during the period November 14 to November 20, 2010. The assessment included a one-day site visit to Klaipeda University on November 16, and a 3-day visit to Vilnius University on November 17-19, 2010.

This report does not necessarily paraphrase or re-present the range of information presented in the Report of the Self Assessment Group (here after: SAG). Instead, it focuses on issues raised in the Self Assessment Report (here after: SAR) as well as raising some issues not addressed in the SAR, but which came to the attention of the ET during the course of the Team’s time in Lithuania, and specifically, during the course of the site visit.

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

The SAG has put an informative SAR together. It presents, in considerable detail, the nature, structure, aims and content of the programme being evaluated, the methods of study, delivery and assessment, issues with regard to quality, resourcing, student support and participation.

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

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

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

The SAR, as presented to the ET consists of a collective volume and an SAR associated with this programme which itself had 4 Annexes. These have all been studied by the ET. This evaluation report relates to the study programme Management of Libraries and Information Centres. (Code – 62409S101)

According to the collective volume of the Self-assessment report, in recent years, the study programmes of the Faculty of Communication have been revised and corrected on Recommendations of the Internal Total Study Programme Assessment carried out in 2005 and in 2008.

## II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

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

#### **1.1. Programme demand, purpose and aims**

##### *1.1.1. Uniqueness and rationale of the need for the programme*

Consideration of the SAR and the meetings with the staff of the Faculty and the Institute indicated that the programme appears to be unique in Lithuania. The content has been developed as a result of extensive interactions with employers and has been designed to meet perceived demands specifically in the areas of management and awareness of technological developments which could affect the delivery of library services. Thus the programme has been developed with specific identified needs in mind. Viewed from a Western European perspective, it is possible to endorse the approach taken and to confirm the need for the areas of knowledge and expertise with which the programme seeks to equip its students. It is all too easy to fill an LIS programme with the technical material of librarianship; the ET endorses the intent of this programme.

##### *1.1.2. Conformity of the programme purpose with institutional, state and international directives*

The SAR indicates that the design of the programme has taken into account state requirements within Lithuania. The SAR further indicates that the programme team has taken account of international developments as listed in various documents on the competencies of librarians (such as Euroguide LIS – Competences and aptitudes for European information centre professionals, the Special Libraries Association, Recommendations of American Library Association, etc.). Further evidence of international awareness is provided in the SAR concerning involvement with international organizations such as IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations) Discussions whilst in the Faculty enabled to confirm the statements in the SAR. We are confident that the programme conforms to current international thinking in LIS education.

##### *1.1.3. Relevance of the programme aims*

The aims of the study programme are to educate professionals capable of developing and communicating long-term strategic programmes of libraries and information centres considering complex changes of the environment, organizing the activities of libraries and information centres by rationally using the available resources, performing research and using its results while developing alternative methods to improve information activities and introducing innovative solutions in the domains of library and information centre activities and services that meet the requirements of contemporary users. The ET endorses the intended aims of the programme and their relevance to the successful operation of Libraries and Information Centres in the twenty first century. The ET congratulates the programme team on its vision and the clarity of its expression.

## **1.2. Learning outcomes of the programme**

### *1.2.1. Comprehensibility and attainability of the learning outcomes*

The Learning Outcomes at programme level (specified in section 18 of the SAR) clearly indicate the intentions of the programme team to equip students on the programme with a set of skills and knowledge which will stand them in good stead in years to come. There are clearly stated outcomes concerning the application of strategic management in the public sector together with awareness of technological developments which may enhance the delivery of library services.

The ET endorses the learning outcomes as specified in the SAR. Furthermore the ET believes that the clarity of expression of these programme level learning outcomes surpasses anything else that we saw during a week considering 7 programmes at 2 universities. We believe that other programme teams would do well to take a lead from this programme.

The ET believes that these learning outcomes are both consistent with the programme aims and appropriate for Masters level education.

### *1.2.2. Consistency of the learning outcomes*

Not only was the ET impressed by the clarity of the learning outcomes at programme level but we were also impressed by the fact that this programme has clearly related the learning outcomes at subject level with the learning outcomes at programme level. The clarity and consistency with which this was achieved and documented at a level we did not observe in any other programme. Accordingly we congratulate the programme team on the quality of their design and suggest that this programme could usefully be adopted as a role model by others.

### *1.2.3. Transformation of the learning outcomes*

The SAR makes it quite clear that the learning outcomes have been transformed (updated) in order to meet changing needs for graduates of the programme. Discussions with the relevant staff have convinced the ET that this process will be maintained on a regular basis into the future.

## **2. Curriculum design**

### **2.1. Programme structure**

#### *2.1.1. Sufficiency of the study volume*

The SAR notes that “The number of credits of the programme corresponds to the requirements for graduate study programmes indicated in Lithuanian legal acts” (SAR paragraph 19). In addition to satisfying this legal requirement, the ET is satisfied that the volume of study as indicated in the documentation provided is adequate to enable the learning outcomes to be achieved.

#### *2.1.2. Consistency of the study subjects*

The subjects indicated in the documentation are appropriate to meet the learning outcomes of the programme as noted in section 1.2.2 of this report. Furthermore, it appears to the ET that the subjects are introduced into the programme in a logical order, which should facilitate student learning. The sequence of subjects is planned in accordance with the model of management cycle with the aim to start with developing general competences, which are followed by the provision of specific knowledge and skills.

### **2.2. Programme content**

#### *2.2.1. Compliance of the contents of the studies with legal acts*

The programme content appears to meet all expected international notions of the content of a programme of this nature. It meets the general requirements of Lithuanian law and conforms to the requirements of Vilnius University.

#### *2.2.2. Comprehensiveness and rationality of programme content*

The ET believes that the content of the programme is both up to date and well suited to meeting the learning outcomes of the programme.

The SAR refers to a range of teaching and learning methods and specifically refers to the use of problem-based learning which it is claimed has been used for approximately a decade on this programme. The ET did not find anything either specifically innovative or unacceptable in the range of teaching and learning approaches intended for use on the programme. Our ability to confirm the claims in the SAR was handicapped by the fact that all the students that we met were on the undergraduate programme.

### **3. Staff**

#### **3.1. Staff composition and turnover**

##### *3.1.1. Rationality of the staff composition*

Details of the staff associated with the programme are detailed in paragraphs 31-36 of the SAR. The SAR reports that “11 qualified teachers implement the programme of Management of libraries and information centres. Pursuant to the general requirements for the study programme of the second cycle<sup>1</sup>, 20 percent of deepening subjects (Strategic Management, Scientific Research Methodology and Digital Library Management) are taught by professors.” The majority of the staff teaching on the programme work within the Faculty of Communication. Given a projected intake of 15 students (SAR, paragraph 34), the intended staff student ratio, again as indicated in the SAR, is generous; the distribution of teaching between staff at different levels is acceptable. The SAR reports the relevant experience of the staff teaching the programme. It is readily apparent that there is a good level of experience in the staff teaching this programme having seen the statements in the SAR, the ET was not surprised to be impressed by the quality of the staff associated with this programme whom we met whilst in the Faculty.

##### *3.1.2. Turnover of teachers*

In discussions with staff, we learned that there has been some turnover of teaching staff but not such that the integrity of the programme would be threatened. Changes in staff were influenced by the programme upgrading process.

Turnover of part time staff on fixed length contracts does have the benefit that it provides an opportunity to remove such staff whose teaching is not adequate. However it was explained that if there were complaints about such staff then the first approach of the faculty would be to try to work with those staff to improve their performance.

#### **3.2. Staff competence**

##### *3.2.1. Compliance of staff experience with the study programme*

There is clear evidence in the range of documentation provided in the SAR that the staff associated with this programme is well qualified to deliver it. The SAR notes (paragraph 32) that there are two professors and five associate professors involved in the delivery of the programme. And in addition there are two professional librarians with more than a decade of experience in

---

<sup>1</sup> Order No. ISAK-1551 of 22 July 2005 of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania “On the general requirements for study programmes” (Official Gazette Valstybės žinios, 2 August 2005, No. 93-3461).

library management who contribute to the delivery of the programme. The staff CV's appended to the SAR provided good evidence of research activity amongst the staff. Having met some of the staff involved with the programme the ET believes that the team is well qualified to deliver this programme.

### *3.2.2. Consistency of teachers' professional development*

Again both the SAR and the site visit provided ample evidence of the continuous professional development within their disciplines of the staff associated with this programme. Most of the staff involved in the programme has their own active research and publication programmes as can be seen from their CVs. One member of the team also teaches at a Swedish university and several others have written textbooks relevant to the subjects which it is projected they will teach.

However, as with other programmes which we have examined, the ET does have concerns that the professional development of staff seemed to be concentrated on their areas of subject expertise and did not appear to address their pedagogic knowledge and skills. Whilst we noted that there is training for new teachers, we have concerns that the skills development of existing teachers appears to be left rather to chance and personal initiative. Given the increasing demands on staff, not least from the increasing use of ICT in teaching, this is a somewhat laissez-faire approach which the Faculty and the university may find it beneficial to review.

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

### **4.1. Facilities**

#### *4.1.1. Sufficiency and suitability of premises for studies*

In general the suitability of premises for studies is good. Lecture halls are of good quality, other teaching rooms are well-equipped and flexible, with projection and other equipment, and seem sufficient in number, although as some facilities are shared there is some competition with other departments. Library study facilities are good and conveniently located.

#### *4.1.2. Suitability and sufficiency of equipment for studies*

There are ample labs equipped with modern computing facilities; neither teachers nor students voiced any complaints about either the availability of access to, or quality of, these resources.

#### *4.1.3. Suitability and accessibility of the resources for practical training*

There appeared to be a good range of appropriate placement locations available, and good relations with employers sponsoring these. Students generally reported no difficulties in finding placements of an appropriate nature.

### **4.2. Learning resources**

#### *4.2.1. Suitability and accessibility of books, textbooks and periodical publications*

Library stocks of printed materials seem appropriate and adequate to student numbers and demand. A shortage of textbooks and other printed materials in Lithuanian was commented on by some and referred to in the SAR (p.5), but overall provision is sound.

#### *4.2.2. Suitability and accessibility of learning materials*

A VLE (Moodle) is provided and student have external access to library databases both internally and externally via VPN. Some teachers also support other electronic delivery methods for materials (e.g. websites) as they prefer not to use Moodle "due to its complexity". We would suggest that this reflects a training issue and one instance of where a formal CPD policy (referred to in 3.3.2 above) might be applied beneficially.

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

### **5.1. Student admission**

#### *5.1.1. Rationality of requirements for admission to the studies*

Requirements for admission to the programme are clearly presented in the SAR. In addition to the “average competitive score”, students who have followed an undergraduate programme in Library and Information Science have to achieve a good score in their undergraduate thesis. Students from other disciplines are subject to an entrance examination and are required to show commitment to the discipline for example by already having a job in the sector. The ET believes that these requirements are appropriate for the specified programme.

#### *5.1.2. Efficiency of enhancing the motivation of applicants and new students*

The SAR includes evidence of demand on behalf of current undergraduates in Library and Information Science. There is also evidence that the relevant staff and students are making attempts to encourage interest in the programme. There is close interaction between the staff running the programme and the major libraries in the Vilnius district which seeks to promote the programme. Since 2009, the blog *Rock&Roll Librarian* has been announcing interesting articles about library innovations, original operational solutions, as well as about interesting, honorable and famous graduates from LIS.

The ET was not made aware of efforts at the levels of University or Faculty to encourage applications to the programme. The ET understands the process whereby State financed places are allocated between the different programmes which has a rational basis. Nonetheless given the current difficult financial circumstances for students, we wish to record our concern that there is such limited support, in the form of studentships, for an exceedingly well designed and developed programme.

### **5.2. Study process**

#### *5.2.1. Rationality of the programme schedule*

There were no students admitted to the programme in 2009. The programme is not operating in academic year 2010-2011 and so we did not meet any current students with whom we could test the claims made in the SAR but taken at face value, these do not cause the ET any concerns.

#### *5.2.2. Student academic performance*

SAR provides data on student performance in academic year 2007-2008 and academic year 2008-2009. The majority of students completed the programme. The data does not give cause for concern regarding the programme. Two students have failed to reach an adequate academic standard and a further student was removed for “failure to meet his financial obligations”.

#### *5.2.3. Mobility of teachers and students*

The SAR provides details of the mobility within Europe through programmes such as ERASMUS of both staff and students. Interestingly there appears to be greater mobility of staff than of students. One member of staff associated with the programme also teaches in a Swedish university, this should enable the students on the programme to be aware of developments in other areas of Europe. The SAR details the home university of people arriving to the Faculty but does not indicate if they have direct involvement with this programme. Whilst we understand the complexities of international exchanges for both staff and students, especially in times of financial difficulty, we would hope that the Faculty will offer whatever support it can and encourage such exchanges to take place since we believe that there are obvious advantages for all concerned.

### **5.3. Student support**

#### *5.3.1. Usefulness of academic support*

Again the lack of a current cohort of students with whom we could test the information provided to us within the SAR, makes it difficult for the ET to make comments with complete confidence. However the SAR provides data that the teaching team makes available the necessary information concerning matters such as programme changes and counseling. Whilst we note that provision is made for students to study by an individual plan (SAR paragraph 61), we also note that none of the students we met on other programmes within the Faculty were aware of this option and so we feel it is unlikely that that students in any future cohort of this programme would be any different unless action is taken.

#### *5.3.2. Efficiency of social support*

The SAR reports that “Students of Vilnius University acquire social support by various means, i.e. participate in sport and cultural activities, receive grants and benefits and use university dormitories. In 2008- 2009, students of the Faculty of Communication participated in sports and artistic activities: basketball (7), football (1), aerobic competition (1), VU Academic choir (5), Women Choir of VU *Virgo* (6), VU Song and dance Ensemble (5), VU brass band *Oktava* (2), VU choir *Jaunimėlis* (1), VU kinetic theatre troupe (1).” In addition the ET observed facilities were good and plentiful, with plenty of student social space in and around the department which was well used, social clubs and activities, refectories, etc. There was no complaint from the student body in regard of social facilities and support.

The lack of financial support for students has been mentioned above (section 5.1.2) and is reiterated at this point.

### **5.4. Student achievement assessment**

#### *5.4.1. Suitability of assessment criteria and their publicity*

Yet again the lack of a current cohort of students with whom we could test the claims made in the SAR, handicapped the ET in its assessment of this aspect of the provision. However given the very positive impression which the team and its programme have made upon the ET, we are reasonably confident that the information presented in paragraphs 65 to 68 of the SAR are an accurate indication of past behavior and future intentions. We are pleased to see that a wide range of assessment methods including student self assessment are in operation.

#### *5.4.2. Feedback efficiency*

Given that we did not meet any current students of the programme, making a statement in this area is rather difficult. However we have no reason to suppose that there would be any differences from the other programmes in the Faculty on which we have reported save for the very positive impression made upon us by the programme staff.

Given the lack of firm evidence to the contrary, we are left to suppose that as in the other programmes, there is some variability in the support offered to students. Assuming that this is the case then we would urge the Faculty to take steps to ensure that there is comparability of support offered by different members of the teaching team.

#### *5.4.3. Efficiency of final thesis assessment*

The SAR outlines the procedure for the defense of final theses in line with university regulations. The ET has concerns about the poor quality of the thesis abstracts and therefore recommends that students be required to provide structured abstracts. One approach which the Faculty might pursue is the structured abstracts required of papers submitted to journals published by Emerald. <<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors/guides/write/abstracts.htm>>. Not the least of the benefits of this approach would be familiarizing students with an approach which they might use in their future careers.

#### *5.4.4. Functionality of the system for assessment and recognition of achievements acquired in non-formal and self-education*

There was no indication in the SAR of any system for this activity, which was confirmed by conversations with teachers who indicated that the intention was that this would be addressed when the move to modular teaching happened. At present such issues are dealt with on a case-by-case basis and cases appear very rare – no students reported having need for this.

The ET suggests that a clear written system for assessment and recognition of achievements acquired in non-formal and self-education should be developed and made widely available to students.

### **5.5. Graduates placement**

#### *5.5.1. Expediency of graduate placement*

The SAR notes that “data about graduate placement are not collected therefore it is not impossible to define placement within the period concerned”. Whilst the ET assumes that many if not all of the graduates of the programme probably already have employment within the sector, it recommends that data in this area should be collected. Ideally this ought to be longitudinal data which would enable the Faculty and Institute to understand the impact that the programme is having on the career paths of its graduates. It would then be possible to answer questions such as “Does a Masters in the Management of Libraries and Information Centres have a positive impact on career development?”

## **6. Programme management**

### **6.1. Programme administration**

#### *6.1.1. Efficiency of the programme management activities*

Programme management within the Faculty of Communication is undertaken by the Committee on the Studies of Library and Information Centres Management. A division of the Faculty of Communication, i.e. Study Division, supports the Committee on Studies. The Committee is comprised of five members (including students’ representative and social partner). The issues related to the introduction of changes into the programme or upgrading the programme are discussed in the Institute of Library and Information Science. The decisions of the Committee are presented for consideration in the Institute of Library and Information Science. Amendments and updates of the study programme are considered and approved by the Study Commission and the Council.

The ET noted throughout its visit some internal tensions among the administration and staff. It was especially evident before the meeting with the staff. We did not observe the obvious degree of collegiality in decision making. It appeared to us that the Faculty administration is organizing discussions about the future of LIS programmes inviting various stakeholders but not inviting the main teachers of the programme and even chairwoman of the Committee on the Studies of Library and Information Centres Management. Assuming that our understanding is correct, this is a curious state of affairs which causes us some concern.

Furthermore, the meeting with alumni revealed dissatisfaction with faculty administration which did not provide enough subsidized places in the MA programme. Whilst we understand that in the views of students and alumni, there are never likely to be sufficient funded places and we appreciate that academic managements are faced with unpleasant choices, it does seem to the ET somewhat unfortunate that a programme which has a clear benefit to the profession and which is the best documented and developed of those we have examined, does not appear to be receiving adequate support.

## **6.2. Internal quality assurance**

### *6.2.1. Suitability of the programme quality evaluation*

The ET notes that internal evaluation and review occurs on a regular basis and on various levels. After the central body – Quality Management Centre – was established, it took responsibility for quality assurance at the University level. The meetings with staff revealed that the Faculty does not trust data they receive from the Quality Management Centre and therefore performs its own evaluation.

The ET suggests that there is scope for closer collaboration and improved cooperation between the Faculty and the Quality Management Centre so that systems are improved and any duplication of effort is removed.. The ET noted that Individual teachers also evaluate their courses either informally through discussions or via printed questionnaires.

### *6.2.2. Efficiency of the programme quality improvement*

Paragraph 71 of the SAR outlines actions taken by the Programme Committee to monitor quality; though this is one area where we are somewhat critical of the team. Statements such as “a number of surveys” are rather vague and at odd with the clarity in much of the rest of the SAR. There is similar vagueness in Paragraph 72 “the quality of the study programme is periodically assessed by the study division of the Faculty by conducting student surveys. We are left wondering what surveys and with what frequency.

There is no mention of the University’s Quality Management Centre, which we learned about in other reviews. And like those other reviews we suggest that there is scope for improved coordination between the different groups involved with quality monitoring and by inference quality improvement.

### *6.2.3. Efficiency of stakeholders participation.*

The ET noted that there are mechanisms in place for the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation of programme quality but is not surprised that the ability and/or willingness of stakeholders to participate are limited. The ET is aware that the Faculty has attempted to overcome this issue but talking to employers, for example, this appeared to be largely a function of employers’ workloads over which the Faculty obviously has no control. It can be observed that this is not a problem unique to Lithuanian institutions.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1. As noted in section 1.2.2, we found the documentation of this programme to be the most impressive that we met all week. The clarity of expression of learning outcomes at programme level and the clear relationship to learning outcomes at subject level were impressive. Accordingly we recommend that the Faculty could usefully view this as a model for the documentation of its other programmes.

3.2. We recommend that improved guidance is given to students on the production of English Language abstracts to their theses and in particular a structured approach to abstracts is adopted as outlined in section 5.4.3.

3.3. We recommend that a clear written system for assessment and recognition of achievements acquired in non-formal and self-education should be developed and made widely available to students. (see section 5.4.4)

3.4. We recommend that data should be collected concerning the career paths of graduates on the programme (see section 5.5.1)

3.5. Whilst recognizing that it is early days in the life of the Quality Management Centre, we recommend that steps are taken to ensure that all the players in the quality improvement process at different levels within the university have their efforts better coordinated.

3.6. We recommend the creation of a programme of pedagogic development for teachers. There is a case to be made for making this compulsory.

#### IV. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Libraries and Information Centers Management* (state code – 62409S101 (new code - 621P11001)) is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study programme assessment in points by fields of assessment.*

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	4
2.	Curriculum design	4
3.	Staff	3
4.	Material resources	4
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>21</b>

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

2 (poor) - 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. Richard John Hartley

Grupės nariai:  
Team members:

Andrew David Dawson

Prof. Dorte Madsen

Gerrit Johannes van der Pijl

Emilija Banionytė

ASSESSMENT FORM

Criterion	Assessment*				
	1	2	3	4	5
<b>1. Programme aims and learning outcomes</b>					
<i>1.1. Programme demand, purpose and aims</i>					
1.1.1. Uniqueness and rationale of the need for the programme				X	
1.1.2. Conformity of the programme purpose with the institutional, state and international directives				X	
1.1.3. Relevance of the programme aims					X
<i>1.2. Learning outcomes of the programme</i>					
1.2.1. The comprehensibility and attainability of the learning outcomes				X	
1.2.2. Consistency of the intended learning outcomes					X
1.2.3. Transformation of the learning outcomes				X	
<b>2. Curriculum design</b>					
<i>2.1. Programme structure</i>					
2.1.1. Sufficiency of the study volume				X	
2.1.2. Consistency of the study subjects					X
<i>2.2. Programme content</i>					
2.2.1. Compliance of the contents of the studies with legal acts				X	
2.2.2. Comprehensiveness and rationality of the programme content					X
<b>3. Staff</b>					
<i>3.1. Staff composition and turnover</i>					
3.1.1. Rationality of the staff composition				X	
3.1.2. Turnover of teachers				X	
<i>3.2. Staff competence</i>					
3.2.1. Compliance of staff experience with the study programme				X	
3.2.2. Consistency of teachers' professional			X		

development					
<b>4. Facilities and learning resources</b>					
<i>4.1. Facilities</i>					
4.1.1. Sufficiency and suitability of premises for studies				X	
4.1.2. Suitability and sufficiency of equipment for studies				X	
4.1.3. Suitability and accessibility of the resources for practical training				X	
<i>4.2. Learning resources</i>					
4.2.1. Suitability and accessibility of books, textbooks and periodic publications				X	
4.2.2. Suitability and accessibility of learning materials				X	
<b>5. Study process and student assessment</b>					
<i>5.1. Student admission</i>					
5.1.1. Rationality of requirements for admission to the studies				X	
5.1.2. Efficiency of enhancing the motivation of applicants and new students			X		
<i>5.2. Study process</i>					
5.2.1. Rationality of the programme schedule				N/A	
5.2.2. Student academic performance				N/A	
5.2.3. Mobility of teachers and students					X
<i>5.3. Student support</i>					
5.3.1. Usefulness of academic support			X		
5.3.2. Efficiency of social support		X			
<i>5.4. Achievement assessment</i>					
5.4.1. Suitability of assessment criteria and their publicity				X	
5.4.2. Feedback efficiency				X	
5.4.3. Efficiency of graduation papers assessment				X	
5.4.4. Functionality of the system for assessment and recognition of achievements acquired in a non-			X		

formal and self-study way.					
<i>5.5 Graduate placement</i>					
5.5.1 Expediency of graduate placement					X
<b>6. Programme management</b>					
<i>6.1. Programme administration</i>					
6.1.1. Efficiency of the programme management activities			X		
<i>6.2. Internal quality assurance</i>					
6.2.1. Suitability of the programme quality assessment			X		
6.2.2. Efficiency of the programme quality improvement			X		
6.2.3. Efficiency of stakeholders' participation			X		

\* – **Values of scores:**

1 – based on this criterion the programme is unsatisfactory, as there are essential shortcomings that must be immediately eliminated;

2 – based on this criterion the programme is poor, as there are a lot of shortcomings which are not essential;

3 – based on this criterion the programme is satisfactory; the programme meets the established minimum requirements and has one or two shortcomings which are not essential;

4 - based on this criterion the programme is good; the programme meets the requirements higher than those established by legal acts;

5 – based on this criterion the programme is excellent; the quality of programme implementation is of an exceptionally high level.