



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Aleksandro Stulginskio universiteto

STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
KAIMO PLĖTROS ADMINISTRAVIMAS (612N70003)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF ADMINISTRATION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(612N70003)

STUDY PROGRAMME
at Aleksandras Stulginskis University

Experts' team:

- 1. PhD. Maria Wolmesjö (team leader) *academic,***
- 2. PhD. Benedikt Friedrich-Albert Konstantin Speer, *academic,***
- 3. PhD. Leif Kaley, *academic,***
- 4. PhD. Regimantas Čiupaila, *social partner,***
- 5. Ms Augustė Dementavičienė, *students' representative.***

Evaluation coordinator – Ms Kornelija Bukantaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba

Report language – English

Vilnius
2016

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Kaimo plėtros administravimas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612N70003
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Viešasis administravimas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (3,5) , ištemptinės (5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	210
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Viešojo administravimo bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2002-06-14

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Rural development administration</i>
State code	612N70003
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Public administration
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	first
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (3,5), Extended (5)
Volume of the study programme in credits	210
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Public administration
Date of registration of the study programme	2002-06-14

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process	4
1.2. General	4
1.3. Background of the Higher Education Institute, HEI.....	5
1.4. The Review Team	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	6
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	6
2.2. Curriculum design	7
2.3. Teaching staff	9
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	10
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	11
2.6. Programme management	13
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	15
IV. SUMMARY.....	16
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	17

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	List of the meeting with senior administration etc.
2	Student’s opinion about the study subject
3	Scientific research areas and subareas
4	Research fields of the Faculty of the Economics and Management
5	Motives to enter the university of first year part-time students (in Lithuanian)
6	Questionnaire of motives and hopes to enter ASU for first year students (in

	Lithuanian)
7	Study subject by the eyes of a student (in Lithuanian)
8	Questionnaire of study quality evaluation for graduates (in Lithuanian)
9	Guide to the Library Use

1.3. Background of the Higher Education Institute, HEI

Aleksandras Stulginskis University (ASU) is a state higher education institution located in the rural area of Kaunas. It has an agricultural tradition since the beginning of the 1920's and was granted the status of University in 1996. ASU follows the University Statute and required Rules and Regulations of the University Council and Senate.

ASU is divided into five faculties: Agronomy, Economics and Management, Forest Science and Ecology, Agricultural Engineering, Water and Land Management; and two centres: Cultural Communication and Education Center, and Mathematics, Physics and Information Technology Center. The number of students was 4636 at the end of 2015. The number of teachers at the same period was 269 and research workers were 33. Out of those, 20 were working in the bachelor programme "Rural Development Administration" at the end of 2015, which is organized and managed by the Faculty of Economics and Management within the area of social sciences. The study field is defined as Public Administration.

The programme is described as unique compared to other Lithuanian Higher Education Institutions since it is the only programme which combines a focus on the rural development administration with public administration. This programme is pointed out as important for preparing professionals for different positions to develop the rural area in Lithuania as well as internationally. The ambitious programme mission is presented in the Self Evaluation Report, (SER, p.4).

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of expert' 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 22/11/2016.

1. **PhD. Maria Wolmesjö (Team leader)** *Faculty of Caring Science, Work Life and Social Welfare, University of Borås, Associated professor in Social Work, Sweden.*
2. **PhD. Benedikt Friedrich-Albert Konstantin Speer,** *Carinthian University of Applied Sciences, Program Director Public Management, Austria.*
3. **PhD. Leif Kalev,** *School of Governance, Law and Society, Study Area Politics and Governance, Study Area International Relations and Future Studies, Professor of state and citizenship theory, Tallin University, Estonia.*
4. **PhD. dr. Regimantas Čiupaila,** *Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Associate professor, Lithuania.*
5. **Ms Augustė Dementavičienė,** *student of Vilnius University PhD in Political Science, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme aims and learning outcomes meet the legal requirements. There is a common syllabus for the Bachelor programme; 612N70003 Administration of Rural Development, with 210 ECTS Credits. The programme is offered both as full-time (3,5 years) and as extended/part-time studies (5 years). For the full-time version there is both an English and a Lithuanian study programme, while the extended/part-time version is only taught in Lithuanian (here, students might work in parallel). Even though the same course syllabus is used, it is understood that literature and given lectures can differ according to the format of the given course (full time/part time) or the used language (Lithuanian/English), since different professors are giving the different courses.

It was clear that the programme is important to the university and the region in particular because of its focus and long tradition of agricultural development and connections to social policy. Based on meetings with the senior administration group, the teaching staff and the social partners, it can be concluded that the programme is unique and highly valued by professionals as there is a practical need of specialists with strategic and critical thinking in rural areas.

Analysis of the SER shows that the programme aims and learning outcomes are well defined, clear and publicly accessible. Aims and learning outcomes are presented at the website and students know where they are available. The review team was provided with the required material and information both in English and in Lithuanian about the programme, it is also available on the HEI's webpage. Learning outcomes are quite ambitious and developed in collaboration between teachers, students and social partners who are invited for regular meetings and part of different committees with meetings six to eight times a year. Comparing the programme aims and learning outcomes with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered, they are consistent.

For a better compatibility of programme name, learning outcomes and content experts suggest to highlight the public administration affiliation of the programme by offering more credits of public administration as such.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design of the “Administration of Rural Development” study programme meets the legal requirements for BA studies. The number of subjects per semester does not exceed 7 for the full-time studies and 5 for the extended studies, also the number of credits and the ECTS are adequate for the programme (SER, pp. 10, 13). From the SER (p. 10) it can be deduced that the full-time (3,5 years) and part-time (5 years) versions of the BA study programme are equal but for the “arrangement of the study subjects and total number of credits in separate semesters”. There is no distinction between study plans or course descriptors for the different forms (full-time, part-time, English/Lithuanian version) of the programme. The study subjects according to Annex 7 of the SER are, however, evenly spread and are not repetitive.

For a programme that wants to “train specialists of public administration..., [by] developing the abilities required for professional activity at public institutions in administration of processes of rural development and building of relations between various rural development actors during provision of public services as well as dealing with other issues related to management of development of rural areas” (SER, p. 6) some questions concerning the nature of the courses remain. In a narrow perspective some courses seem not to be necessary in order to reach the aims of the programme – e.g. Philosophy, The Development of Society – while others are lacking (there is a course on Civil Law, but none on Public Law or European Law, both central to the administration of rural development). Also the electives in Annex 11 to the SER, which cover

broadly the fields of Humanitarian Sciences, Social Sciences, Biomedicine Sciences and Technological Sciences, are either so general or thematically so far away from the study subjects that they hardly enable the students to specialize in certain curriculum-relevant areas. It is questionable, if the right – mentioned by the university - to choose freely other subjects or even areas of study can surrogate programme specific electives. Some smaller adaptations of the curriculum could change this. In general, the content of the subjects is consistent with the type and level of the studies and regarding rural development the programme reflects the latest achievements in science, art and technologies as shown by the competencies conveyed by the programme (organizational and planning skills, ability to learn, ability to work independently with IT, ability to prepare and execute projects, ability to show initiative, SER, p. 14).

The alignment of general learning outcomes (called “main” and secondary” objectives in the SER) with the learning outcomes at the level of the single courses (called “course objectives” in the SER) seems to be systematic and well developed. At the programme level they have to be consistent with the 1st, 2nd and 3rd partial objectives of the study programme (Annex 6) while at the course level they have to be complemented by the respective learning methods as well as by assessment criteria and methods of learning outcomes. Students, therefore, know what is expected of them and how they will be assessed. The content and methods of the subjects are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, as defined in the course descriptors. Nevertheless, the students apparently focus only on learning methods and assessment criteria and had no idea about the meaning of learning outcomes. Here, a sensitization for the importance of learning outcomes seems to be necessary.

The adaptation of the course descriptors is revised by 2 reviewers, of whom one is a practitioner or a member of the Study Programme Committee (SER, p. 12). During the on-site visit it was mentioned that the adaptation of the syllabuses is done annually. The adaptation to the – admittedly rather general - Descriptor of the Study Field of Public Administration, in force since 23 July 2015, could be further enhanced by a matrix.

The subjects are not repetitive, but there are – as is to be expected - some interrelations between them (SER, p. 11). Those linkages are not only highlighted in the course descriptors, but also in Annex 8 “Bachelor Study Programme Administration of Rural Development: Scheme of Logical Links”. This scheme is, however, not very well constructed and should be thoroughly revised. The interrelations make it necessary that “[a]ctive communication and cooperation among teachers allows them to share experience, discuss the contents of subjects and assignments with

the members of Programme Committee” (SER, p. 11). The review team had the impression that this task is well recognized by the staff of the programme.

Students must participate in “practical training sessions and perform practical assignments” (SER, p. 13). Nevertheless, employers criticise that they may have a lot of academic knowledge, but are not able to apply it practically, lack interpersonal skills and are unable to use information sources (SER, P. 14). However, this self-critique has not been repeated during the session with the social partners, so that apart from the above mentioned minor points the scope and the organisation of the programme is sufficient to wholly ensure learning outcomes.

2.3. Teaching staff

The evaluation of the teaching staff meets with the legal requirements. The study programme is provided by: six professors, 14 associate professors as well as 3 lecturers with a doctoral degree and 9 not holding a doctoral degree. The staff members are mainly from the Business and Rural Development Management Institute and the Institute of Economics, Accounting and Finances at ASU. Some doctoral students from these departments are also involved. There is also a cooperation with other departments at ASU as e.g. the Institute of Energy and Biotechnology Engineering and the Centre of Cultural Communication and Educology. This requires functioning cooperation-mechanisms which should be institutionalized. One associate professor from the University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland, is also taking part in the programme. The number of teaching staff is adequate, most of them are employed by ASU, work full time at the university and seem to live in the area.

There is a high academic level of the teaching staff. In 2015/2016 more than 70% of the credits were given by teaching staff holding a doctoral degree (SER p. 16, 17). The teaching staff turnover is described and explained in the SER (p.17). The share of professors has been extended and the average age of professors has been reduced from 51.9 to 48.8 during the latest five years period. The CVs of the teaching staff are adequate for this programme and show that the bases for high-level teaching are existent at the programme level.

Teaching staff in general has a long experience from practical as well as educational work. They are combining giving lectures with doing scientific research and every fifth year an “attestation for the purpose of verification of compliance of qualifications” is conducted (SER p. 18). The

review team got the impression that the teaching staff members are active in writing articles and take part in international research, study projects and conferences. However, the output in international publications could be higher and should be actively enhanced by the faculty. Almost the same amounts of teachers are incoming as outgoing. Visits are limited by lack of financial resources and sometimes by teacher's communication skills in foreign languages (SER p. 19). The conditions for a professional development of the teaching staff are good and lecturers are offered language courses in English to be able to teach the foreign students. The teaching staff of the programme is mainly involved in research directly related to rural development, but there are few professors and a lack of research on public administration. Here, changes should be actively enhanced. Teachers supervising bachelor theses of Lithuanian students should also emphasize more the use of international publications as there was a lack of these in the theses given to the review team.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The Faculty offers 34 different facilities including ordinary classrooms, computer classrooms, specialized distance learning classroom, methodological study and specialized practical business training classroom. This makes the premises for studies adequate both in their size and quality. Computer classrooms were fully upgraded and equipped in 2013-2014 and specialized software (HansaWorld, Kontora) is used. These classrooms are occupied from six to eight hours a day including time for independent work of students. A majority of students own their personal computers, something, which can be expected to increase in the future. Since students have their own computers, the offered possibilities to free access to Internet at the campus area are important. The BA programme "Administration of Rural Development" does not require much special equipment, so the teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) is adequate both in size and quality.

The Faculty provides more than 1500 workplaces. There seems to be a good relation and collaboration with different companies and municipalities in the neighbourhood. The Faculty has established the Entrepreneurship Development Centre, which was visited during the site visit. The Centre promotes students' interest in practical business training and innovative skills development. For the public sector, to which the study programme "Administration of Rural Development" belongs, there is, nevertheless, a lack of specialized IT applications (4-5 applications shall be purchased in 2016/2017, SER, p. 25).

The library is located in a building at the Campus area and teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are available. The main point of criticism was the blatant lack of English literature as well as of specialized literature on public administration. Here, notable improvements in the library equipment are necessary. However, most of the literature recommendations by professors are on-line journals and e-books. Internet and a good access to different databases makes it possible to find teaching and learning material worldwide, which is especially important for the foreign but also for the Lithuanian students.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The admission requirements are fair and appropriate for the programme. Admissions are organized using General Regulations for General Admission to the First-Level and Continuous Studies at Lithuanian Higher Education Institutions. The programme is quite well advertised and benefits from its international reputation and that of the ASU. Several activities, including open events and conferences, are used to promote the university and the programme. Detailed information about the programme and admission is accessible in Lithuanian and in English on the website. The places in the bachelor programme are divided in state financed and self-paid. Programme managers are aware of the decrease of student numbers and quite high dropout rates and discuss counter-measures.

The organization of the study process is well planned and managed and there is adequate provision of the achievement of the learning outcomes for all semesters. Students are individually consulted by the staff of the programme. The Internet based Moodle platform is used to communicate with part-time students. Also, students are encouraged to participate in research activities and the methods of teaching are quite various. One of the internships could be understood as problem-based learning example (running business company). The development of a more public administration focused approach could be an interesting idea.

Various surveys concerning the quality of the given courses are done regularly and their results are used to improve the study process. All programme responsables seem committed to ensure that the information from the surveys is actively used. From SER and from the on-site visit it was also clear that students are encouraged to participate in various activities of the programme. They can actively take part in the scientific-practical conference "Good Practice of

Strengthening Competitiveness of Lithuanian Rural Areas” which is held once in two years. Also, at faculty level, there is a writing contest for the students from all programmes and all study cycles. Finally, there are also lecturers who are doing joint research with their students.

Students have the opportunity to participate in mobility programmes, but do not actively do this, even if such opportunities are well advertised. The SER states that during 2009-2016 only 25 students participated in student mobility programmes. During the same period 51 incoming ERASMUS students came to this programme from universities abroad. Students – especially Lithuanians – were referring to work, financial issues and language skills as reasons why they couldn’t participate. These, however, are very hard to be influenced by the programme responsables.

All in all, the aim of the academic support system can be understood as to guide the students purposefully towards self-study, provide assistance in study management, career planning, and stimulate motivation to study. Students receive a high level of academic support. During the on-site visit, students and alumni assured that lecturers are easily reachable during their contact hours and also afterwards.

The student assessment structure is very well explained and means of assessing students’ performance are clear and transparent. Information is available on the website. The cumulative assessment scheme measures students’ knowledge and skills. Students’ performance is assessed by mid-term examinations, tests, homework, teamwork assignments, projects, oral presentations, and final examinations. During the on-site visit it was clear that student’s homework or papers are commented on by the teachers, but there seems to be no general method to do so. A recommendation could be to develop a general feedback system for such kind of work.

In the case of the Lithuanian speaking group the bachelor theses rarely contained English citations. In general, the topics were rather from rural development than from public administration. As mentioned before, the latter aspect should be strengthened.

The majority of graduates who took part in the interviews considered that the programme prepared them well for the labor market and gave them the necessary competencies. The wide

diversity of their activities was neither in their nor in the programme responsables' view a problem but rather an advantage.

2.6. Programme management

The responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated. There is a clear division of responsibilities among the various institutions, the roles, procedures and outputs are understandable and systematic. During the on-site visit the review team was quite satisfied with the respective answers to questions regarding the programme management, which is thoroughly elaborated and also taken care of in practice.

Information and data on the implementation of the programme is regularly collected mainly through electronic surveys among students and alumni. Also meetings with social partners are used for data collection and evaluation of the programme. The collected data seems to be analysed and utilised in various layers, mainly: (1) teacher's self-reflection and work in developing the content of courses, (2) assessment of teacher's performance by superiors, e.g. in deciding on prolonging the contracts, (3) work with the content and implementation of the curriculum through various committees and councils. From outside, it is of course not easy to assess the exact degree of exploitation of the accumulated knowledge, but the system seems to be in place and working.

Based on the SER and on-site visit it can be concluded that the internal quality assurance measures are elaborated and in place and their orientation towards quality assurance is comprehensible. It is more difficult to assess their effectiveness and efficacy. Several layers of internal reporting may generate a too extensive material and information flow with too many steps in university hierarchy.

ASU has also regularly participated in the national quality assurance system evaluation. With regard to external quality assurance there is a summary of recommendations of the previous (2009) evaluation and the assessment of the progress in implementing these. The programme has acted in line with the recommendations and made progress in some important aspects, e.g. student feedback and marketing, but there is still some space for improvement, e.g. regarding

student international mobility. In broad terms, internal and external evaluations alike are used for the improvement of the programme.

The programme seems to have a strong and diverse partners' network, with many institutions represented and people participating. The partners include e.g. the Ministry of Agriculture, regional and municipal authorities and local non-governmental actors and their associations. The partners see the programme as relevant and are broadly satisfied with it. As discussed during the on-site visit the partnership activities include practical training for students, expert work by the members of academic staff, regular social partners meeting and ad hoc contacts. Partners tend to emphasise the practical aspects in the further development of the curriculum, while the programme management also has to pay attention to academic aspects and to find an adequate balance for a university type of curriculum (not a college type applied curriculum). This difference has to be clearly emphasized in the discussion with social partners.

In sum, the programme is well managed. A possible point of further reflection is if it would be possible to achieve similar results with less administrative burden. Maintaining a complex implementation and monitoring system may lead to a risk of focusing too much on bureaucratic aspects of programme provision at the expense of attention to academic aspects. Points which have to be attended for in this regard by the programme management are e.g. research methods, quality of theses and a higher importance of the public administration content compared to rural development.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations based on the analysis are made for follow-up actions:

1. ASU is recommended to rethink - according to the programme aims and learning outcomes - to better highlight the public administration affiliation of the programme.
2. As the programme is also delivered in English it is necessary to ensure to have more literature on Public Administration in English.
3. Further recommendation is to develop a common course for both international (English speaking) and Lithuanian students to develop teachers' as well as students' skills in English and gain knowledge from different countries, cultural issues and perspectives.
4. Oral comments after assessments are already given and appreciated by students. Our recommendation is to develop this and combine this with written comments.
5. Recommendation to develop students' skills in academic research methods (students mainly referring to SWOT-analysis and content analysis as research methods during the on-site visit). Young researchers conferences, where students are giving presentations, could be one step in this direction. The close relationship between students and teachers and involving students in on-going research is a great opportunity which is offered at this programme and should be developed even further.

IV. SUMMARY

The review team was provided with a big amount of documents, which complemented the self-evaluation report (SER) together with meetings with more than 60 persons involved in the different programmes. Initially, the team was surprised that there were English versions of the programme, since this was not mentioned in the SER. Regardless of this, the overall impression of this bachelor programme on “Administration of Rural Development” and its organisation is good.

The curriculum design is well operated and there is a good structure of learning outcomes. Also the relations and communication between teachers and students seem to be good. Furthermore, there is an impressive collaboration between the programme and different professional actors in the region. Even though – or especially because - the Faculty gives a very organized impression, the administrative burden for teaching staff seems to be high. Localities/facilities at ASU have recently been renovated and are good.

The English version of the programme shows that the bachelor programme is able to recruit international students and that the teachers can lecture in a foreign language. According to students, ASU has a good reputation internationally. Students are ambitious and plan to go back to their own countries to work with society changes and rural development. During their studies, the contact with the Lithuanian students could be enforced, e.g. by combining classes for Lithuanian and international students, which is something the review team recommends. The level of internationalisation is high for incoming students but needs to be developed to increase the amount of out-going students.

Given the good quality of the programme management, the review team is convinced that the minor necessary changes and recommendations will be efficiently put into practice.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Administration of Rural Development* (state code – 612N70003) at Aleksandras Stulginskis University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	4
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	19

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	PhD. Maria Wolmesjö
Grupės nariai: Team members:	PhD. Benedikt Friedrich-Albert Konstantin Speer
	PhD. Leif Kalev
	PhD. Regimantas Čiupaila
	Ms Augustė Dementavičienė

**ALEKSANDRO STULGINSKIO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
KAIMO PLĖTROS ADMINISTRAVIMAS (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621N70002)
2017-04-20 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV8-62 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Aleksandro Stulginskio studijų programa *Kaimo plėtros administravimas* (valstybinis kodas – 612N70003) vertinama teigiamai.

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

* 1 - Nepatenkinamai (yra esminių trūkumų, kuriuos būtina pašalinti)

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

3 - Gerai (sistemiškai plėtojama sritis, turi savitų bruožų)

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Ekspertų grupei buvo pateikta didelis kiekis dokumentų, papildančių savianalizės suvestinę. Buvo surengti susitikimai su daugiau nei 60 darbuotojų, dalyvaujančių vykdant skirtingas studijų programas. Iš pradžių ekspertų grupė nustebė sužinojusi, kad studijų programa dėstoma ir anglų

kalba, nes apie tai neminima savianalizės suvestinėje. Bendras įspūdis apie bakalauro studijų programą *Kaimo plėtros administravimas* ir jos vykdymą yra geras.

Studijų programos sandara atitinka reikalavimus, studijų rezultatai tinkamai apibrėžti. Dėstytojai ir studentai palaiko gerus santykius ir bendrauja tarpusavyje. Vykdamas studijų programą glaudžiai bendradarbiaujama su įvairių sričių kaimo plėtros specialistais regione. Nors fakulteto veikla yra gerai organizuota, dėstytojų administracinio darbo našta atrodo didelė. Pastaraisiais metais atnaujintos ASU patalpos ir įranga yra geros būklės.

Tai, kad anglų kalba dėstoma studijų programa pritraukia užsienio studentų, rodo dėstytojų gebėjimą skaityti paskaitas užsienio kalba. Studentų nuomone, ASU turi gerą tarptautinę reputaciją. Tikslų siekiantys studentai planuoja grįžti į savo šalį ir savo darbu prisidėti prie visuomenės pokyčių ir kaimo plėtros. Studijų metais reikėtų skatinti užsienio ir Lietuvos studentų bendravimą, pavyzdžiui, ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja rengti bendras paskaitas Lietuvos ir užsienio studentams. Iš užsienio atvyksta studijuoti daug studentų, tačiau reikia skatinti, kad daugiau universiteto studentų išvyktų studijuoti į užsienį.

Nors studijų programa vykdoma kokybiškai, ekspertų grupė tikisi, kad keli svarbūs pokyčiai ir rekomendacijos bus veiksmingai įgyvendinti.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

Išanalizavus studijų programą, rekomenduojama imtis šių tęstinių veiksmy:

1. Rekomenduojama, kad ASU, atsižvelgdamas į studijų programos tikslus ir rezultatus, apsvarstytų galimybę, vykdamas studijų programą, suteikti daugiau svarumo viešajam administravimui.
2. Kadangi studijų programa dėstoma ir anglų kalba, reikia pasirūpinti, kad būtų daugiau leidinių apie viešąjį administravimą anglų kalba.
3. Rengti bendras paskaitas užsienio studentams (kalbantiems anglų kalba) ir Lietuvos studentams, kad būtų ugdomi dėstytojų ir studentų anglų kalbos įgūdžiai bei būtų galima įgyti žinių apie kitas šalis, susipažinti su jų kultūra ir perspektyvomis.

4. Studentai palankiai vertina galimybę žodžiu išsakyti savo nuomonę apie įvertinimus. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja toliau vystyti šią praktiką ir taip pat suteikti studentams galimybę pateikti nuomonę raštu.
5. Rekomenduojama vystyti studentų gebėjimus taikyti akademinį tyrimų metodus (per ekspertų vizitą studentai, kaip pagrindinius tyrimų metodus, dažniausiai minėjo stiprybių, silpnybių, galimybių ir grėsmių (SSGG) analizę bei turinio analizę). Reikėtų skatinti dalyvavimą jaunųjų tyrėjų konferencijose, kuriose studentai pristato pranešimus. Ekspertų grupė palankiai vertina glaudų bendradarbiavimą tarp studentų ir dėstytojų bei studentų įtraukimą į vykdomus tyrimus. Šią praktiką reikia ir toliau vystyti.

<...>

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)