



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Šiaulių universiteto

***APLINKOS IR PROFESINĖS SAUGOS STUDIJŲ
PROGRAMOS (61204T105, 612H17005)***

VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

**EVALUATION REPORT
OF *ENVIRONMENTAL AND PROFESSIONAL SAFETY*
(61204T105, 612H17005)
STUDY PROGRAM
at Šiauliai University**

Grupės vadovas:
Team Leader:

Prof. David Eastwood

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. Maris Klavins

Prof. Dietwald Gruehn

Lina Šleinetaitė – Budrienė

Gražvydas Jakaitis

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2013

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Aplinkos ir profesinė sauga</i>
Valstybinis kodas	61204T105, 612H17005
Studijų sritis	Technologijos mokslų
Studijų kryptis	Bendroji inžinerija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4), iššęstinė (5,5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Aplinkos inžinerijos bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2000 m. birželio 16 d. Švietimo ir mokslo ministro įsakymu Nr. ISAK – 831

INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAM

Name of the study program	<i>Environmental and Professional Safety</i>
State code	61204T105, 612H17005
Study area	Technological Sciences
Study field	General Engineering
Kind of the study program	University Studies
Level of studies	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (4), part-time (5,5)
Scope of the study program in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Environmental Engineering
Date of registration of the study program	16 of June 2000, under the order of the Minister of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania No. ISAK – 831

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2. Curriculum design	6
3. Staff	8
4. Facilities and learning resources.....	9
5. Study process and student assessment.....	10
6. Programme management	11
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	12
IV. SUMMARY	14
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	15

I. INTRODUCTION

The external evaluation of Šiauliai University (hereafter, SU) 4 years Bachelor study programme *Environmental and Professional Safety*, partly also named as *Environment and Professional Safety*, was initiated by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education of Lithuania nominating an expert panel, consisting of Professor David Eastwood, as a team leader (University of Ulster, Ireland), Professor Maris Klavins (University of Latvia, Latvia), Professor Dietwald Gruehn (Dortmund University of Technology, Germany), Lina Šleinotaitė-Budrienė, employer representative (Lithuania), and Gražvydas Jakaitis, student representative (Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Lithuania).

For the evaluation the following documents have been considered:

1. Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes;
2. General Requirements of the First Degree and Integrated Study Programmes;
3. General Regulations for Technological Science (engineering) studies;
4. Law on Higher Education and Research of Republic of Lithuania;
5. Procedure of the External Evaluation and Accreditation of Study Programmes.

The evaluation is based on the analysis of the Self-Evaluation Report (hereafter, SER) and its annexes, which were finalized by the self-evaluation group in January 2013 and further information obtained during the visit of the expert panel on 27th February, 2013.

The visit included meetings with different groups connected with Šiauliai University to capture different perspectives on the study programme: the administrative staff of the university, self-evaluation group, which was headed by Prof. V. Tričys, teaching staff responsible for the *Environmental and Professional Safety* study programme, stakeholders, including graduates and potential employers, and students of different years of study.

The expert panel inspected various facilities, such as classrooms, library, computer equipment, and laboratories. Furthermore, students' final works were reviewed. After the expert panel discussions and additional preparations of conclusions and remarks, preliminary general conclusions of the visit were presented. After the visit the experts discussed and agreed on the content of the report, which represents the expert panel's consensual views.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. *Programme aims and learning outcomes*

The programme aims are “to provide students a university education by awarding a bachelor’s degree in environmental engineering and train for practical activities and further second cycle studies; to train bachelors of environmental engineering of great erudition, creatively and critically thinking, having knowledge in mathematics and physical sciences, fundamentals in engineering, social sciences and environmental engineering, capable of independently solving environment protection, saving working capacity of people and sustainable development issues, able to take legal, social and ethical responsibility, having skills of lifelong learning and abilities to follow and respond to environment changes and adapt to changing social environment requirements” (SER: p. 6). The aims are formulated as focussed not only on a competitive labour market, but also on pedagogical and societal goals, such as life long learning, as well as social and ethical responsibility.

These aims relate to the “outcomes of first cycle studies” in terms of the Dublin descriptors (SER: table 3). On this basis, five groups of learning outcomes are defined, comprising:

1. Knowledge and its application;
2. Abilities in carrying out research;
3. Special abilities (trouble shooting, realizing creative tasks, perception of emerging problems);
4. Social abilities;
5. Personal abilities.

Even if it is difficult to distinguish between social and personal abilities – both cover different types of communication skills – for each group of learning outcomes a subset of 3 or 4 criteria has been defined. Additionally, a matrix has been developed (SER: table 5), indicating the relationship between study programme subjects and the above mentioned learning outcomes groups.

Hence, programme aims and learning outcomes are reasonably well defined, clear and publicly accessible on the University website. This was confirmed during the visit: in the past years several Bachelor graduates of the *Environmental and Professional Safety* programme continued their studies and completed *Environmental Engineering* or related Master programmes in Vilnius or Kaunas. Meanwhile, four of them even hold a PhD degree, what gives evidence of a sound

quality of the learning outcomes of the evaluated programme as a basis for a process of life long learning.

Despite the fact that programme aims and learning outcomes seem to be well defined, in practise, they are mainly based on academic requirements. Professional requirements, as well as needs of the labour market, are less considered: the programme is partly lacking in its practical components and some practical lessons of the programme have even been replaced by excursions and other contents. These findings may be supported by the fact that co-operation of university staff and employers is not highly developed and should be intensified in the future.

Furthermore, the number of admitted students has dramatically decreased during the last years. Thus it remains unclear whether or not there is a stable regional demand for the minimum number of graduates which would be necessary for insuring any long-term perspective for the study programme.

To increase the reputation, popularity and effectiveness of the programme, the expert team recommends amplifying the skills portfolio, especially in the field of Environmental Law, Environmental Management and Environmental Impact Assessment, and with giving due consideration to both national and international legal and management requirements.

With exception of the above mentioned shortcomings, (Environmental Law, Management, Impact Assessment, lack of practice) the programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered.

While learning outcomes, contents and qualifications offered are compatible with each other, there is a problem with the term “Professional Safety”, which is not clearly defined. Thus, the expert panel suggests more accurately reflecting and redefining the programme title.

2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design considers different needs of full-time and part-time students. The duration of the programme is 4 years for full-time students and 5.5 years for part-time students.

With exception of criteria listed below, the curriculum design meets legal requirements:

1. The number of course units per semester should not be more than 7; in fact the number of courses is 8 during the 7th semester and 9 during the 3rd semester (SER: table 6, p. 12-13).

While developing the Study Plan, it is therefore recommended to pay more attention to the assignment of subjects to the study field related subjects and to have clear rationales for including subjects in mathematics and physics.

A further weak point of the curriculum design is the volume of practical placement, which should not be less than 15 ECTS. Even if this criterion is formally achieved, the evaluation visit gave evidence that there is a lack of practical training in the programme. This was addressed not only by students, but also respectively by social partners or employers. It was even mentioned that there are partly non-practical (or even theoretical) lessons offered under the title “Practice 1”, “Practice 2” or “Practice 3”.

With exception of the above mentioned example (number of courses > 7), study subjects and modules are almost evenly spread and, what is more important, the themes are not repetitive.

In contrast to this, a logical sequence of study process cannot be stated for all study subjects. For example, the expert team scrutinized, and were concerned, why Engineering Graphics starts before Mathematics is finished. Thus, the study plan is not necessarily logical.

The content of the subjects and / or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies; however, in future, more attention should be paid to the topics of Environmental Law and Management, as well as Environmental Impact Assessment. For the rest, the scope of the programme is appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

The content of the programme generally reflects the latest achievements in science and technologies. However, because of financial restrictions, technical equipment and software is not in all aspects state of the art.

3. *Staff*

The study programme is provided by staff meeting legal requirements. From 34 teachers who are involved in the programme, 28 teachers hold a PhD degree. 22 of them are professors (19 associate professors and 3 full professors). Hence, the majority of the teaching staff has a scientific degree and means that the qualification of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure learning outcomes.

Since the programme has a decreasing number of students and applicants, the number of the teaching staff is (more than) adequate to ensure learning outcomes; the crucial question for this programme is not how to provide students with teachers, but how to attract students to choose this study programme instead of others.

The teaching staff turnover seems to be sufficient to ensure an adequate provision of the programme in the mid- or long-term, if needed. There were no complaints by the students about the age pattern of the Faculty.

According to the SER (p. 17), teachers are appointed by public competition. Agreements with teachers are signed for a five-year term. Furthermore, a commission formed by the Senate decides whether or not applicants for the positions satisfy the requirements. Despite the fact that these regulations are designed to promote competition among the teachers, the scientific activities of most of the teachers are not well developed. International staff mobility is very low, knowledge of English is mostly poor, and, despite of decreasing number of students, the publication output of most teachers is very low, especially in the last two years. According to the SER (p. 17), in the years 2008 – 2012 teachers of the programme have published 16 scientific articles. Given, that there are 34 teachers involved in the programme, this means the average teacher publishes no more than 1 article in a 10 years period, which is extremely low. Annex III – Description of Teacher Activity – reveals that most teachers did not publish any articles during the last two or three years. Hence, the higher education institution does not sufficiently create the conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme. This is a severe point, because it indicates that there has been nearly no response to the 2005 external evaluation recommendations to encourage teachers to take a more active part in scientific work and to improve their scientific qualifications. It should be mentioned that the SER (p.17) highlights some research projects which have been successfully acquired in the last couple of years dealing with improvements in the scientific competence of higher school teachers and enterprise specialists, television on ecology in the internet, and the development of renewable energy resources and improvement of

environmental conditions. Nonetheless it still remains obscure as to whether or not teachers have personal aims to further develop their skills, and if so, in which direction.

Additionally, there seems to be a limited availability of support by technical assistants for the teaching staff.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the relation and co-operation of teaching staff to / with employers should be improved.

In the future, teaching staff should focus on:

1. Increasing the volume of studies in foreign languages, including elements of the study process in foreign languages (English and / or Russian);
2. Inviting English speaking guest lecturers from abroad, as well as from other Lithuanian institutions;
3. Motivating students to take a more active part in study abroad programmes.

4. Facilities and learning resources

The premises for studies are adequate in terms of size and quality. However, facilities and learning resources are not adequate in all aspects. According to the SER (p.19), at the Faculty level there is no shortage of computers, at present the Faculty has about 200 computers. On the other hand, in the last few years no major investments in infrastructure have been made. Basic equipment is mostly available, but this is partly old-fashioned technical equipment and software, for instance, AutoCad from 2006. Also, laboratory equipment is partly not up to date or there are only few devices (e.g. pH meters) available for student use. Hence, current conditions do not allow the demonstration of the latest technological achievements to the students.

Even after the Faculty has signed co-operation agreements with some enterprises (SER: p.20), the higher education institution still lacks adequate arrangements for students' practice; very often student practice is missing and teachers make excursions instead of practice.

Teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and mostly accessible. 2 Libraries are open 6 days a week (10 hours a day), but Wi-Fi did not work in the library.

Hence, the expert team suggests that serious efforts should be made for improvement in the technical infrastructure (e.g. SER: table 11: only 1 pH meter).

5. *Study process and student assessment*

The admission requirements are well-founded, but the major problem is absence of students, or of applicants. The programme obviously does not attract students, which is indicated by the small number of students who are first choice applicants to the study programme. On the other hand, the drop-out rate is moderate.

The fact, that full-time students are better qualified on entry than part-time students (SER: p. 22) and state financed students are better qualified than self-paying students (SER: p. 21), does not cause any problems for the study process. With exception of above mentioned practical issues, the organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme.

Students are encouraged to participate in applied research but, due to the insufficient English knowledge of teaching staff and students, publications in international top-journals are neither sufficiently recommended by teachers, nor used by the students. In general, despite the fact that a considerable number of international journals are available online in the library, the awareness about relevant international journals is very low.

Theoretically, students have opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes, such as ERASMUS. In fact, only a few students take the opportunity to study abroad. The main reasons for this appear to be insufficient preparation in English, insufficient financial support, and insufficient awareness among students of the potential afforded by international experience, especially for their own career prospects.

The higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic support by supervising students during their studies. Explicit social support is not obviously established, even if there is a good relationship between students and teachers. However, the university provides a career centre supporting students in their future development.

The assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available (at module level). For example, criteria for student achievement assessment are announced at the beginning of the semester, and the teachers feedback to students on their assessment achievements by commenting on them both orally – individually, discussing the results with students, and in writing – by pointing out the mistakes they have made, and other shortcomings (SER: p. 26).

The professional activities of graduates partly meet the programme providers' expectations. On the one hand, there is a high employment rate, but employment according to specialization is

relatively low. As mentioned above, some Bachelor graduates of the *Environmental and Professional Safety* programme have successfully finished their Master or PhD programmes at other universities, which indicates a sound quality of the evaluated programme.

6. Programme management

The responsibilities for programme decisions and the monitoring of the implementation of the programme are not always clearly allocated. There is some evidence that there is no absolute sense of ownership of the programme, for example, regular (monthly meetings) are missing and there is a general lack of dynamism targeted at the ongoing development of the programme. The evaluation visit revealed only a limited strategy on how to attract future additional students to ensure programme viability in the mid-term. Goals for the ongoing development of the programme over the next 5-10 years therefore remained obscure.

Information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analyzed, but market analysis and SWOT analysis are absent. The opportunity of writing the Self Evaluation Report was not used to determine weak points as basis for a programme improvement.

The outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are partly used for the improvement of the programme. Individual teachers' level module evaluations are regularly used. However these do not appear to be collated at a programme management level and survey outcomes appear to be insufficiently communicated to the students. Stakeholders appear to be insufficiently involved in the evaluation and improvement processes. Some internal quality assurance measures are undertaken therefore, but their effectiveness and efficiency remains unclear.

The expert team therefore recommends a reorganisation of the management structure of the programme and a number of prerequisites to be fulfilled over the next three years, especially the implementation of strategic planning which differentiates and explicitly specifies management responsibilities for the programme, and which creates a positive sense of programme ownership. In the immediate term, a further vital management task must be to improve the successful acquisition of structural funds in order to improve current levels of technical equipment.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To increase the reputation, popularity and effectiveness of the programme, the expert team recommends amplifying the skills portfolio, especially in the field of Environmental Law, Environmental Management and Environmental Impact Assessment and to give due consideration to both national and international legal and management requirements. The programme should include more practice and co-operation of university staff with employers should be intensified in the future. Effective measures have to be undertaken to ensure a stable number of applicants necessary for insuring a long-term perspective for the study programme. The expert panel suggests accurately reflecting and redefining the programme title.

2. Small changes in curriculum design are needed to meet legal requirements (the number of course units per semester should not be more than 7). Likewise it is recommended to pay more attention to the assignment of subjects to the study field related subjects and to have clear rationales for including subjects in mathematics and physics

3. Teachers should be encouraged to take a more active part in scientific work and to improve their scientific qualifications, especially by strengthening their international relationships, participating more frequently at international conferences and publishing more in international journals. Teachers should also encourage students to read about and reflect on the results of the latest research published in international journals. Technical support for the teaching staff should be improved. In future, teaching staff should focus on:

1. Increasing the volume of studies in foreign language, including elements of the study process in foreign languages (English and/or Russian);
2. Inviting English speaking guest lecturers from abroad, as well as from other Lithuanian institutions;
3. Motivating students to take a more actively part in study abroad programmes.

4. The expert panel suggests serious efforts for improvement of technical infrastructure, including software, latest technical equipment and unlimited Wi-Fi-access in the libraries. More attention should be paid to applications for European Union structural funds to improve the equipment, at least in a mid-term perspective.

5. International student mobility should be promoted and increased. Employment, according to specialization, should be increased. Co-operation with the University career centre should be improved.

6. The expert panel recommends reorganizing the management structure of the programme to include the implementation of strategic planning with differentiated and explicitly specified programme responsibilities. Future management must also vigorously promote the successful acquisition of European Union structural funds and other research grants to improve current technical equipment.

IV. SUMMARY

The education quality of the *Environmental and Professional Safety* programme is on a good level. However, a stronger focus on Environmental Law, Environmental Management, Environmental Impact Assessment and practice would help to improve the programme.

The curriculum design meets most legal requirements. However, some changes in the curriculum are necessary to ensure a logical structure of the programme.

Teachers do a good job in terms of student achievements of learning outcomes. But teachers should be encouraged to take more active part in scientific work and to improve their scientific qualifications, especially by strengthening their international relationships, participating more frequently at international conferences and publishing more, not only in national, but also in international journals.

The study programme is equipped with basic infrastructure and a good library. The expert panel suggests serious efforts should be made to improve technical infrastructure, including software, the latest technical equipment and unlimited Wi-Fi access in the libraries.

Programme management is the weakest point of the different evaluation areas. The expert panel recommends reorganizing the management structure of the programme. A strategic plan should be implemented. Acquisition of EU structural funds and other research grants has to be improved.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Environmental and Professional Safety* (state code – 61204T105, 612H17005) at Šiauliai University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study program assessment in points by fields of assessment.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Program aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Staff	2
4.	Material resources	2
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	2
6.	Program management (program administration, internal quality assurance)	2
	Total:	12

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas:
Team Leader:

Prof. David Eastwood

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. Maris Klavins

Prof. Dietwald Gruehn

Lina Šleinotaitė – Budrienė

Gražvydas Jakaitis

**ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
APLINKOS IR PROFESINĖ SAUGA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612H17005) 2013-04-19
EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-105 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Šiaulių universiteto studijų programa *Aplinkos ir profesinė sauga* (valstybinis kodas – 612H17005) vertinama teigiamai.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	2
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	12

* 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

Studijų programos *Aplinkos ir profesinė sauga* skiriamasis bruožas yra kokybiškas dėstymas. Vis dėlto didesnis dėmesys aplinkos apsaugos teisei, aplinkos apsaugos vadybai, poveikio aplinkai vertinimui ir praktikoms prisidėtų prie studijų programos kaip visumos kokybės gerinimo.

Nors studijų programos sandara atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus, tačiau pakeitimai, kuriais būtų pagrįsta studijų programos loginė struktūra yra būtini.

Dėstytojai sukuria sąlygas numatomų studijų rezultatų pasiekimui. Vis dėlto reikėtų skatinti dėstytojus aktyviau dalyvauti moksliniame darbe ir kelti savo mokslinę kvalifikaciją, ypač stiprinant tarptautinius ryšius, dažniau dalyvaujant tarptautinėse konferencijose ir skelbiant daugiau publikacijų ne tik nacionaliniuose, bet taip pat ir tarptautiniuose žurnaluose.

Studijų programa yra aprūpinta pagrindiniais materialiais ištekliais, pakankamai geromis sąlygomis veikia biblioteka. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja skirti labai daug dėmesio siekiant tobulinti materialiuosius išteklius, įskaitant programinę įrangą, naujausią techninę įrangą ir neribotą belaidžio interneto prieigą bibliotekose.

Studijų programos vadyba yra silpniausia studijų programos sritis. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja pertvarkyti programos valdymo struktūrą. Reikėtų įgyvendinti strateginį planą. Studijų programos vykdytojai turėtų dalyvauti Europos Sąjungos struktūrinių fondų ir kituose mokslinių tyrimų projektuose.

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Siekiant pagerinti studijų programos reputaciją, populiarumą ir efektyvumą, ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja išplėsti studijų programoje įgyjamas kompetencijas papildomais įgūdžiais ir žiniomis aplinkos apsaugos teisės, aplinkos apsaugos vadybos bei poveikio aplinkai vertinimo srityse, taip pat atinkamai atsižvelgti į nacionalinius ir tarptautinius aplinkos apsaugos teisės bei vadybos reikalavimus. Į studijų programą turėtų būti įtraukta daugiau praktikų, o studijų programos vykdomas bendradarbiavimas su socialiniais partneriais turėtų būti aktyvesnis. Reikia imtis efektyvių priemonių, užtikrinančių pastovų stojančiųjų skaičių, kuris reikalingas ilgalaikiam studijų programos vykdymui. Ekspertų grupė siūlo iš naujo tiksliai apibrėžti studijų programos pavadinimą, kuris atspindėtų jos esmę.
2. Studijų programos sandara atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus. Rekomenduojama daugiau dėmesio skirti studijų dalykų priskyrimui studijų kryptims, taip pat logiškai pagrįsti matematikos ir fizikos studijų dalykų įtraukimą į studijų programą.
3. Dėstytojai turėtų būti skatinami aktyviau dalyvauti moksliniuose tyrimuose ir kelti savo profesinę kvalifikaciją, ypač stiprinant tarptautinius ryšius, dažniau dalyvaujant tarptautinėse konferencijose, taip pat skelbiant daugiau publikacijų tarptautiniuose moksliniuose žurnaluose. Be to, dėstytojai turėtų skatinti studentus susipažinti su tarptautiniuose žurnaluose paskelbtais naujausiais mokslinių tyrimų rezultatais ir juos reflektuoti studijų procese. Reikėtų tobulinti techninės pagalbos akademiniam personalui teikimą. Akademinis personalas daugiausia dėmesio ateityje turėtų skirti:

1. Studijų užsienio kalba apimties didinimui (anglų ir (arba) rusų);

2. Anglų kalba dėstančių lektorių iš užsienio, taip pat lektorių iš kitų Lietuvos aukštųjų mokyklų pritraukimui;
3. Studentų aktyvesnio dalyvavimo tarptautiniuose mainuose skatinimui.
4. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja dėti labai daug pastangų techninės infrastruktūros vystymui, įskaitant programinę įrangą, naujausią techninę įrangą ir neribotą belaidę prieigą prie interneto bibliotekose. Daugiau dėmesio reikėtų skirti paraiškų Europos Sąjungos struktūriniams fondams teikimui, siekiant pagerinti materialijų išteklių kokybę bent vidutinės trukmės laikotarpiu.
5. Turėtų būti skatinamas studentų mobilumas. Reikėtų pagerinti įsidarbinimo pagal specialybę rodiklius, taip pat vykdyti aktyvesnį bendradarbiavimą su universiteto karjeros centru.
6. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja pertvarkyti programos valdymo struktūrą, įtraukiant į studijų programos vykdymą strateginio planavimo įgyvendinimą bei aiškiai paskirstant ir nurodant atsakomybes už studijų programos vykdymą. Be to, būsimi už programos vadybą atsakingi asmenys privalo skatinti Europos Sąjungos ir kitų su moksliniais tyrimais susijusių lėšų panaudojimą, siekiant tobulinti materialiąją bazę.

<...>

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

¹ Žin., 2002, Nr. 37-1341.