STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

PANEVĖŽIO KOLEGIJOS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *APLINKOS APSAUGA*
(valstybinis kodas – 653H17001)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

EVALUATION REPORT
of STUDY PROGRAMME *ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION*
(*state code* – 653H17001)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at PANEVEZYS COLLEGE

1. **Prof. dr. Olav Aarna (team leader),** *academic,*

2. **Prof dr. Judit Padisák,** *academic,*

3. **Prof. dr. Soon-Thiam Khu,** *academic,*

4. **Prof. habil. dr. Arvydas Povilaitis,** *academic,*

5. **Ms. Lina Šleinotaitė-Budrienė,** *representative of social partners',*

6. **Ms. Inga Bačelytė,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator –

Ms. Natalja Bogdanova

Vilnius
2016

———————————————————————

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	*Environment Protection*
State code	653H17001
Study area	Technological Sciences
Study field	General Engineering
Type of the study programme	College studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (3), Part-time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	180
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Professional Bachelor of Environmental Engineering
Date of registration of the study programme	04-09-2002

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 higher education institution; 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 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.	The Study Programme Committee adjusted the Programme in 2015 according to the national and European environmental regulations and also the employers' comments. In the recent Programme shortcomings of the material under evaluation were solved (e.g. SER page 7: "The Programme doesn't fully complies with the general engineering study field requirements for the description, having entered into force in September of 2015. "

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

Panevezys College (hereinafter – College) is the State Higher Educational Institution established by the Resolution of the Lithuanian Government in 2002. The strategic goal of the College is to increase its competitive advantage and social responsibility through smart specialisation, quality standards compatible with the level of studies, and strong leadership. ***The Environment Protection*** study programme (hereinafter – Programme) was created and registered in 2002. The same year first full-time students were admitted to the Programme. Part-time studies started in 2010.

In 2013 the College quality management system was certified according to the ISO 9001:2008 standard. In 2013 the SKVC awarded the College institutional accreditation for 6 years. On the 1st December 2015 the College had 24 study programmes with 1570 students.

The basis for the evaluation of the Programme is the Self-Evaluation Report (hereinafter SER), its annexes, and the results of site visit by the review team to the College on 5 May 2016. The visit included meetings with different groups: administrative staff of the College, members of the group, which prepared the SER, teaching staff, students of all years of study, graduates, and employers. The review team also made acquaintance with the College premises (classrooms, laboratories, library, computer facilities), students' final theses and other materials. After review team internal discussions introductory conclusions were presented. After the visit, the review team met to discuss and agree upon the content of the report, incl. recommendations and general assessment, which represents the review team consensual understanding.

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 the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *5ᵗʰ May 2016.*

1. **Prof. dr. Olav Aarna (team leader),** *International expert for quality assessment in HE, Adviser to the Managerial Board of Estonian Qualification Authority Kutsekoda, Vice-Rector for Research and Development, Estonian Business School, Estonia.*
2. **Prof dr. Judit Padisák,** *Director of Institute of Environmental Sciences, University of Pannonia, Hungary.*
3. **Prof. dr. Soon-Thiam Khu,** *Professor of Urban Water System Engineering, Head of Civil Engineering Department, School of Engineering, Monash University, Australia.*
4. **Prof. habil. dr. Arvydas Povilaitis,** *Professor of Environmental Engineering, Head of Water Resources Engineering Institute, Aleksandras Stulginskis University, Lithuania.*
5. **Ms. Lina Šleinotaitė-Budrienė,** *expert for environment protection, director of JSC "Ekokonsultacijos", Lithuania.*
6. **Ms. Inga Bačelytė,** *Master student of study programme "Applied ecology", Aleksandras Stulginskis University, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The aim of the Programme (SER, page 5) is "to train environment protection specialists being able to organise environmental activities in enterprises and institutions, to design and implement modern environmental technologies, to carry out environmental research, moreover, to collect and analyse environmental information and provide it to the public, finally, being ready for lifelong learning and professional development." The Programme has been improved following the recommendations of the previous evaluation in 2013. A positive feature of the Programme is the facilitation of student mobility and an option for motivated students, after completing bridging courses, continuing their studies at Master's level in a university.

The Programme learning outcomes (hereinafter – LOs) are coherent with the Programme aims and are formulated in nine statements all covered with the relevant list of modules/subjects. The Programme LOs are clear, well-defined, publicly available (http://studijos.panko.lt), and focussed on academic and professional requirements, public needs, incl. lifelong learning. Additionally, the Programme aims and LOs are introduced in the annual Career Days and Study Fairs. The College Study and Career Centre together with students and teachers regularly organise visits to high schools to popularise the Programme.

The Programme LOs are based on the *General Engineering Study Field Description* approved by the order of the Minister of Education and Science, valid until September 2016. In 2014, the Study Programme Committee, having evaluated the national and European environmental regulations, and also the employers' recommendations, provided the proposal for the College Academic Council for the amendments of LOs and renewal of the Programme content, making it more practice oriented in cooperation with social partners.

In terms of the new *General Regulation of Technological Sciences (Engineering) Study Field* valid since September 2016, the Programme aims and LOs are, in general, consistent with the type and level of studies and qualification awarded, but are only partially compatible with the name of the Programme. Observations of the review team are in line with the interviews with social partners and students revealing some ambiguity about the orientation of the Programme. The name of the Programme is *Environmental Protection*, and it contains elements of three areas: Environmental Protection, Environmental Engineering and Environmental Management without a clearer focus on these areas.

Although the aims and LOs of the Programme are based on the professional requirements for this type of studies, public and labour market needs, the graduates experience some difficulties in finding jobs that correspond to their qualification. The reasons behind this are largely external:

finding job on public service requires mostly a university diploma, while small enterprises prefer to contract consultants to deal with their environmental issues rather than to employ an expert permanently. Therefore, the review team recommends strengthen the identity of the Programme (for more details see p. 2.2 and 2.6).

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design is adjusted to the needs of full-time and part-time students and meets the legal requirements. The duration of the Programme is three years for full-time students and four years for part-time students, while the workload is distributed proportionally throughout semesters. The Programme has no specialisations, which seems to be a flexible strategy in a situation, where social partners are not consistent about the proper direction of development.

Although the content of the subjects and modules is appropriately selected, not repetitive and consistent with the level of studies, the scope of the Programme is only partially consistent with its name (*Environment protection*), since nature conservation is completely missing. Since the laboratory facilities, the e-book collection and the research opportunities for students are fairly limited, the subjects/modules fail to reflect recent achievements in science and technology (for more details see p. 2.4).

The contents and methods of teaching the courses are appropriate for the achievement of most of the expected LOs. During the interviews the students expressed their need for more elective subjects.

The SER states that the Final thesis is an individual applied research work. The student has to demonstrate the attained sufficient knowledge and skills, excellent analytical and design work experience. The final work is prepared on the basis of the following documents: *Procedures of the preparation and defending of final work* (projects) adopted by the decision of the Academic Council and the methodologies approved in the Department. On the other hand, Applied Research is an elective subject. The review team recommends declaring Applied Research a compulsory subject.

Another related observation is that while the level of final theses is sufficient and in line with the type of studies, international research literature is practically not used in preparing the final theses. Also, the technical level of referencing in the theses is insufficient and inconsistent.

The review team has identified five issues challenging the Programme sustainability and employability of the graduates: 1) the present demographic trends in Lithuania, 2) the tendency of private sector to contract consultants for solving environmental issues, 3) low competiveness of graduates without work experience, and 4) increasing competition among institutions offering similar study programmes. The review team recommends the College to analyse carefully these

challenges and develop a clear strategy aiming at improving the Programme long-term sustainability and the employability of graduates.

2.3. Teaching staff

The qualification and practical experience of the 27 teachers delivering the Programme meets the legal requirements for this type of studies. Three teachers have doctoral degrees and two are PhD students. The review team encourages the College to increase the share teachers with doctorates.

The number and qualification of teaching staff allows achieve the Programme LOs. The students and social partners emphasised easy accessibility of teachers and their readiness to solve group and individual problems of students.

The College has developed a teacher in-service education and training (INSET) plan aiming at increasing teacher's competence via seminars, courses, internships, project training, cognitive visits, participation in scientific-practical conferences. The College supports these activities financially or by ensuring flexible workload. Despite these efforts, many teachers are not involved in research. Due to confused structure of information in the Annex 3 of the SER (items according to INSET are listed chronologically with unclear information on their participation, active or passive, at different events) it is impossible to get a clear understanding about scientific and publication activity of the teaching staff. During the visit, many teachers were quite confused when they were asked about participation at scientific events; most of them mentioned participation at pedagogical courses.

The age structure of teaching staff delivering the Programme is somewhat alarming: two teachers are under 30, six – from 31 to 45, seven teachers are from 46 to 60 and the rest eight teachers are over 60. The review team recommends the College to develop a clear strategy for teaching staff turnover.

During the visit it became evident that the teachers are not familiar with the LOs based approach, especially understanding the link between assessment and LOs. The review team recommends to include systematic training of teaching staff in implementing the LOs based approach following the constructive alignment concept.

Another critical experience for the review team has been the inability of most teachers to use English as working language. While some students' are quite fluent in English, only a few of the teachers (mostly those having or working towards PhD degree) were able to communicate in English. The same weakness was also mentioned in the previous evaluation report in 2013. Although the College has organised language courses of different level to improve the language

competence of teachers, success or even advancement is very modest. These efforts should be substantially intensified and made more systematic. The language issue has a cascading effect to other fields of teachers' activity:

- low scientific activity;
- low mobility;
- lack of students from other countries;
- insufficiency in supplying students with relevant international publications;
- low level of participation at international scientific events and in international R&D projects.

The review team also recommends invite more guest teachers both from abroad and from regional enterprises to widen the scope of knowledge and experience provided, and to improve the employability of students.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The College has substantially improved its infrastructure during the past several years, especially concerning modernisation of auditoria and IT facilities. These are sufficient in their capacity and quality. Less progress has been achieved in developing infrastructure for laboratory practice, particularly for the students of the Programme. Apart from a very basic chemistry lab with some microscopes, no other specific equipment is available to acquire practical skills or to carry out any kind of experimental research. As a consequence, students can acquire practical skills almost exclusively during practical placement at regional environmental protection departments, municipal ecology divisions, local businesses, waste handling companies, etc.

The SER provides very detailed information on the overall extent and content of information sources (books, data bases) accessible in the library, but it is much less specific in providing information on such infrastructure developed particularly for this study Programme. As experienced during the visit, teaching materials like textbooks, description of practices are in general accessible for the students, many also through the internet. The College apparently has not recognised the need for setting up a collection of e-books, international journals and books particular for this study Programme.

To increase the academic level of final thesis, facilitate research, and improve learning conditions of part time students, the review team recommends developing an e-book collection specific for the Programme, which includes not only textbooks but also open access e-books and journals.

Following the recommendation from previous evaluation in 2013, the College have improved practical placement especially for full time students. The organisation and content of practices are considered appropriate by the full-time students but cause difficulties for the part-time students, since some of them have to use their holidays for practical placement.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The student admission requirements and procedures are well formulated, publicly available and correspond to government regulations. The number of students decreased in the past several years, which is in line with general demographic trends and therefore not particular for this College. The relatively high proportion of part-time students reflects the importance of the Programme for regional development.

The majority of student places are state funded. On 1 October 2015 only two full-time students paid for their tuition, while 75% of part-time student places were state financed. About 10% of the Programme graduates continue in Master's studies. Students participate in Erasmus+ programme exchange, basically taking practical placements abroad.

The curriculum design and the organisation of the study process formally ensure achievement of expected LOs, but the Programme content needs some adjustments (see p. 2.2).

The assessment structure is well presented, clear and publicly available. A ten grades scale is used and the final grade is built up from several components (laboratory work, projects and individual assignments) and the final exam. During the interviews students expressed their satisfaction concerning the transparency of assessment. However, it is unclear to what extent the assessment system is constructively aligned to the LOs, to the teaching and learning, and students' assessment (see p. 2.2). Clear relationships between the grade levels and the LOs seem to be missing.

Given limited facilities and the minimal research activity of the teachers, students have little opportunity to participate in research and there has not been indication (for example research papers with students' contribution) of participation in applied research offered by social partners. Free choice of the final thesis topics is positive, but on the other hand, it is an indication of limited research opportunities, e.g. in externally financed projects (see p.2.3).

Participation in mobility programmes, e.g. Erasmus+, has been an open choice for students. Unlike during the previous evaluation in 2013, some students have demonstrated proficiency in English.

Both academic and social support is provided at College level. According to students' and social partners' perception teachers provide a friendly learning environment as well as systematic help in solving emerging problems and finding practical placements.

Employers were satisfied with the graduates' knowledge and motivation. However, employability of graduates has been a serious problem (see p. 2.1).

In the context of the Bologna process, especially in promoting the student mobility, recognition of prior learning (RPL) is extremely important. As an example, students referred to the lack of possibility to recognise their English language competence.

2.6. Programme management

The College has a clear Programme management and quality assurance structure (see SER Figure 5, page 26, further detailed in Table 9, page 27 clarifying activity areas, implementers/presenters and decision makers). The Study Programme Committee is involved in many activities, however cannot take any decisions related to the Programme design, development and implementation. As a consequence, the Programme management system is only loosely linked to those who have the broadest overview on the performance of the Programme. Apparently, this results in uncertainties in tasks and responsibilities.

Ambiguities in the Programme management were identified already by the previous external evaluation in 2013. The action plan for implementing the expert recommendations was prepared and approved in 2014 (SER p. 29-30). The implementation was considered by the College Academic Council in November 2015. The review team recommends the College to revise the Programme management structure delegating clear ownership of the Programme to the Study Program Committee. The College top management also needs to make a clear decision on the future orientation of the Programme (towards environmental protection, environmental management or environmental engineering), and adjust the Programme aims, LOs and the name of the Programme accordingly.

The College has developed a strategy for the period 2014-2020, which includes assessment criteria for different fields of activity (e.g. *"assessment of students' final practice in the job sector, part of the students having studied abroad, decrease of students' wastage* (sic!), *a part of client final theses, income for scientific applied or counselling activities, joint scientific publications of College lecturers and social partners"[1]).* From the Programme's point of view these are rather quality indicators. Unfortunately, the strategy does not tell anything about the long-term sustainability of the Programme. The interviews revealed that the Study Programme Committee has

---

[1] These are also examples of poor English provided by the SER.

identified some measures to alleviate the problem, such as introduction of specialisations (environmental monitoring control, wastewater management, nature protection), or initiating a joint programme in cooperation with Kaunas University of Technology, while the students can complete bridging courses at the College. However, these plans have not been developed further. The review team urges the College top management and the Study Program Committee to carefully analyse the positioning of this Programme in the regional labour market and develop clear strategy for its further development.

Social partners actively participate in the evaluation and development of the Programme at individual or department level, but apparently are not involved on the strategic decision making level.

Some aspects of internal quality assurance (e.g. documenting academic achievements of teaching staff) are confusing and incomparable with practice of other higher education institutions (course and conference participations mixed with abstracts, publications, project participations, etc.). This limits the possibility to evaluate adequately academic and pedagogic achievements, and, as a consequence, to assess the effectivity and efficiency of internal quality measures.

2.7. Examples of excellence

The review team noted a particularly impressive practice: in the final theses the students in accordance with the expected LOs self-assess the knowledge and competences they achieved during the final thesis preparation.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Strengthen the identity of the Programme by clearly defining the ownership (the Study Programme Committee involving regional stakeholders) and assuring strong leadership.

2. Define the clear orientation of the Programme and adjust the Programme aims, LOs and the name of the Programme accordingly.

3. Develop strategic plan aiming at long-term sustainability of the Programme and employability of the graduates.

4. Incorporate nature conservation related content into the Programme.

5. Make Applied Research a compulsory subject in the Programme.

6. Train teachers for a better understanding and implementation of the constructive alignment: the relationship between the programme aims, learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, and students' assessment.

7. Introduce teachers' appraisal and motivation system with clearly defined criteria for different areas of academic activity (teaching, research, participation in projects).

8. Improve linguistic skills of the teachers, especially English, to support research activities and international mobility.

9. Facilitate PhD studies and increase the number of teachers with PhD degree.

10. Consider wider involvement of guest teachers from abroad and regional organisations.

11. Substantially improve laboratory facilities specific to the Programme.

12. Develop a collection of e-books and open access journals specific to the Programme.

IV. SUMMARY

Starting from the **programme aims and learning outcomes,** the review team appreciates the efforts of the College to harmonize the content of the curriculum with the Programme LOs and the intensive engagement of social partners in this process. However, the orientation of the Programme (environmental protection, environmental engineering or environmental management) is somewhat unclear, and needs strategic planning stemming from the needs of regional labour market and job opportunities for the graduates.

A positive feature of the **curriculum design** is the improved holistic content of the curriculum. The College offers good possibilities for part time studies. The organisation of practical placement has substantially improved in the last three years. The level of the final theses is good, although technical level of referencing needs substantial improvement (standardisation). Involvement of guest lecturers (both national and international) is fairly limited as well as involvement of students into research is at very low level. The scope of the Programme is only partially consistent with its name, since nature conservation is completely missing.

The **teaching staff** is very motivated in pedagogic work and accessibility of teachers is good both for students and social partners. On the other hand, research (both academic and applied) is minimal, which is certainly related to inability of most teachers to use English as working language. Mobility of the teachers is also very limited.

Concerning the **facilities and learning resources** the infrastructure, especially auditoria and IT facilities have been substantially improved. However, the laboratory facilities specific to the Programme are very modest. There is an apparent lack of e-materials (books, journals) relevant for the Programme.

Overall, the **study process and student assessment** is well presented, clear and publicly available. The students are satisfied with the transparency of assessments. However, the assessment system is loosely linked to the Programme LOs, and LOs at module/subject level.

The **Programme management** is lacking clear leadership and ownership of the Programme as well as a strategy to ensure long-term sustainability of the Programme and employability of graduates. The assessment system of the teachers is confuse, lacks transparency and considerably deviates from the practice of other higher education institutions. In general, changes after the last evaluation remained largely at formal level.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Environment Protection* (state code – 653H17001) at Panevezys College 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	2
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	2
	Total:	**14**

*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. dr. Olav Aarna**

Grupės nariai:
Team members: **Prof. dr. Judit Padisák**

                                Prof. dr. Soon-Thiam Khu

                                Prof. habil. dr. Arvydas Povilaitis

                                Ms. Lina Šleinotaitė-Budrienė

                                Ms. Inga Bačelytė

PANEVĖŽIO KOLEGIJOS PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *APLINKOS APSAUGA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 653H17001) 2016-09-21 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-208 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Panevėžio kolegijos studijų programa *Aplinkos apsauga* (valstybinis kodas – 653H17001) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	2
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	**14**

* 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

Pradedant nuo studijų programos *Aplinkos apsauga* **tikslų ir numatomus studijų rezultatų**, ekspertų grupė vertina kolegijos pastangas suderinti šios programos turinį ir numatomus studijų rezultatus ir intensyvų socialinių partnerių dalyvavimą šiame procese. Tačiau šiek tiek neaišku, į ką ši programa orientuota – aplinkos apsaugą, aplinkosaugos inžineriją ar aplinkos valdymą? Be to, būtinas strateginis planavimas, kylantis iš regiono darbo rinkos poreikių ir absolventų darbo galimybių.

Teigiamas **programos sandaros** požymis yra pagerintas studijų turinio holistinis turinys. Kolegija suteikia geras galimybes ištęstinių studijų studentams. Per paskutiniuosius trejus metus iš esmės pagerėjo praktikos organizavimas. Baigiamųjų darbų lygis yra geras, nors techninį referavimo lygį reikia iš esmės gerinti (standartizuoti). Atvykstančiųjų dėstytojų (vietinių ir iš užsienio) yra nedaug, be to, labai nedaug studentų dalyvauja mokslinių tyrimų veikloje. Šios programos apimtis tik iš dalies atitinka jos pavadinimą, nes neįtraukta gamtos išsaugojimo tema.

Dėstytojai labai motyvuoti pedagoginiam darbui, jie lengvai prieinami ir studentams, ir socialiniams partneriams. Antra vertus, mokslinių tyrimų (akademinių ir taikomųjų) atliekama minimaliai, o tai, be abejo, susiję su tuo, kad daugelis dėstytojų negali vartoti anglų kalbos kaip darbinės kalbos. Dėstytojų judumo lygis taip pat gana žemas.

Kalbant apie **materialiuosius išteklius**, infrastruktūra, ypač auditorijos ir IT įranga, pastebimai pagerėjo. Tačiau šiai programai įgyvendinti reikalingos laboratorinės įrangos yra labai nedaug. Akivaizdžiai trūksta šiai programai reikalingų e-išteklių (knygų, žurnalų).

Apskritai **studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas** organizuojami gerai, yra aiškūs ir viešai skelbiami. Studentus tenkina vertinimo skaidrumas. Tačiau vertinimo sistema yra tik apytiksliai susijusi su visos programos ir atskirų modulių/dalykų studijų rezultatais.

Programos vadybai trūksta aiškaus vadovavimo (*leadership*) ir atsakomybės (*ownership*), nėra strategijos, kaip užtikrinti šios studijų programos ilgalaikiškumą ir jos absolventų įsidarbinamumą. Dėstytojų vertinimo sistema yra paini, nepakankamai skaidri; ji smarkiai nukrypsta nuo kitų aukštųjų mokyklų praktikos. Apskritai, po paskutiniojo vertinimo atlikti pakeitimai daugiausia yra formalūs.

<…>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Stiprinti studijų programos *Aplinkos apsauga* tapatumą aiškiai apibrėžiant atsakomybę (Studijų programos komitetas, į kurį įeina regiono socialiniai dalininkai) ir užtikrinant tvirtą lyderystę.

2. Aiškiai apibrėžti, į ką ši programa orientuota, ir atitinkamai suderinti programos tikslus, numatomus studijų rezultatus ir pavadinimą.

3. Parengti strateginį planą, kurio tikslas – šios programos ilgalaikiškumas ir absolventų įsidarbinamumas.

4. Į programos turinį įtraukti su gamtos išsaugojimu susijusį turinį.

5. Mokslo taikomuosius tyrimus įtraukti į privalomuosius šios programos dalykus.

6. Mokyti dėstytojus geriau suprasti ir įgyvendinti darnų išdėstymą (*constructive alignment*) – ryšį tarp programos tikslų, numatomų studijų rezultatų, mokymo ir mokymosi ir studentų vertinimo.

7. Diegti dėstytojų vertinimo ir skatinimo sistemą su aiškiai apibrėžtais kriterijais, taikomais kiekvienai akademinės veiklos sričiai (mokymui, tyrimams, dalyvavimui projektuose).

8. Gerinti dėstytojų kalbinius, ypač anglų kalbos, įgūdžius siekiant sustiprinti mokslinių tyrimų veiklą ir tarptautinį judumą.

9. Palengvinti doktorantūros studijas ir padidinti daktaro laipsnį turinčių dėstytojų skaičių.

10. Apsvarstyti iš užsienio ir regioninių organizacijų atvykstančių dėstytojų skaičiaus didinimo klausimą.

11. Iš esmės pagerinti šios programos įgyvendinimui reikalingą laboratorinę įrangą.

12. Didinti šiai studijų programai reikalingų e-knygų kolekciją ir laisvą prieigą prie žurnalų.

<...>

2.7. Gerosios praktikos pavyzdžiai

Ekspertų grupė atkreipė dėmesį į ypač įspūdingą praktiką – baigiamuosiuose darbuose studentai, atsižvelgdami į numatomus studijų rezultatus, patys įvertina žinias ir gebėjimus, įgytus rengiant baigiamąjį darbą.

<...>

_____

Paslaugos teikėjas patvirtina, jog yra susipažinęs su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)