



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

MYKOLO ROMERIO UNIVERSITETO
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *TERITORIJŲ PLANAVIMAS IR
APLINKOS VALDYMAS (valstybinis kodas - 621S30001)***
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

**EVALUATION REPORT
OF *TERRITORIAL PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL
MANAGEMENT (state code -621S30001)***
STUDY PROGRAMME
at MYKOLAS ROMERIS UNIVERSITY

Experts' team:

1. **Prof. dr. Erwin van der Krabben (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. Matthew Carmona,** *academic,*
3. **Mr Audrius Petkevičius,** *representative of social partners'*
4. **Mr Simonas Pusvaškis,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator -

Ms Gabrielė Bajorinaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Teritorijų planavimas ir aplinkos valdymas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621S30001
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Teritorijų planavimas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (1.5); Iššęstinės (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	90
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Teritorijų planavimo magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2012-04-25 Nr. SV6-18

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Territorial Planning and Environmental Management</i>
State code	621S30001
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Territorial Planning
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1,5 years); Part-time (2 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	90
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master in Territorial Planning
Date of registration of the study programme	25 April 2012, Order No. SV6-18.

© 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 HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information	4
1.4. The Review Team	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	5
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	12
2.7. Examples of excellence *	13
III.RECOMMENDATIONS.....	14
IV. SUMMARY.....	15
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.	Corrected table of Territorial Planning Self-evaluation
2.	Numbers of Study programme in 2013-2015

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

The basis of the evaluation of the Territorial Planning and Environmental Management Program is the Self-Evaluation Report (SER), dated May 2016, its annexes and the site visit of the review team to Mykolas Romeris University, 8 November 2016. The SER has been prepared by a staff team, consisting of seven members and led by Dr. Pranas Mieraukas. The taks of the Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

self-evaluation are clearly defined, and the report is precise and comprehensive. Additional information with regard to student numbers was provided after the visit, on request of the team.

The visit incorporated all required meetings with different groups: the Mykolas Romeris University administrative staff, the staff responsible for the preparation of the SER, teaching staff, students, alumni and social partners. However, unfortunately review team was only able to speak to a rather limited number of teaching staff, students and alumni. Additionally, the review team was invited to visit various facilities and to review students' work (master theses). The site visit concluded with the review team presenting its first impressions of the program after the visit and general conclusions to the self-evaluation team. After the visit, the team met to discuss and agree the content of this report, which represents the members' consensual views.

The Master program "Territorial and Environmental Planning" was approved by MRU Senate Resolution No. ISN-24 on 16-03-2012 and accredited by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education on 13-04-2012, Order No: SV2-134. The title of the program was changed in 2015 into "Territorial Planning and Environmental Management". The program has not been evaluated before; the current evaluation is the first one.

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 8/November/2016.

- 1. Prof. dr. Erwin van der Krabben (team leader)**, *Professor of Spatial Planning, Department of Spatial Planning, Radboud University, the Netherlands.*
- 2. Prof. dr. Matthew Carmona**, *Professor of Urban Design, Bartlett School of Planning, University College London, Great Britain.*
- 3. Mr Audrius Petkevicius**, *consultant at UAB "Ellex", Lithuania.*
- 4. Mr Simonas Pusvaskis**, *master student of Aleksandras Stulginskis University, study programme "Agricultural Economics", Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

In 2012 Mykolas Romeris University (MRU) launched the master program "Territorial Planning and Environmental Management (TPEM). With the program MRU aims to train territorial planning and environmental management specialists who would be able to organize and manage planning and implementation processes in accordance with environmental

requirements and social as well as economic developments. According to the TPEM team, the program's focus on territorial planning with a social science background offers a unique approach in Lithuanian higher education, since other territorial planning programs either have a background in engineering or in architecture. Graduates of the program are trained to become process managers with sufficient subject specific competences to be able to communicate with relevant stakeholders in the planning process and to organize these processes in an efficient way. The additional focus on environmental management provides graduates with expertise in environmental issues (i.e. contaminated land; effects of climate change) in relation to planning.

Both the general and subject specific competences, the learning outcomes of the TPEM program and the study subjects that are taught in the program seem to be in line with such a foreseen role for graduates from the program. Results from a survey among students show that the TPEM program and its aims are clear to students. To find more evidence of labour market demand for TPEM graduates, the teaching team conducted in 2015 a survey amongst potential employers. The survey particularly focussed on the (future) need for territorial planning experts with a social sciences background. Though the review team (hereinafter – RT) had some difficulties with interpreting the results of the survey (also after discussion with the staff; see below), the outcomes of the survey do confirm a (limited) expected demand for graduates of the TPEM program.

The TPEM program management emphasizes, as one of the strengths of the program, the niche on the labour market it concentrates on. The RT heard during the meetings that one of the weaknesses of the program is that, despite the close relation of the contents of the program with planning practice, it has so far been difficult to involve lecturers with practical knowledge in the program. As one of the planned actions for improvement, the program management mentions that it will put effort in involving more practitioners in the program in the future.

After the meetings with MRU senior management and faculty administration staff and the teaching staff, RT was pleased to confirm the commitment of both MRU senior management and the teaching staff to invest time and effort in the program and to overcome some of the difficulties the program must deal with in this starting stage. These difficulties seem to be due to, among other things, both low students numbers and staff turnovers (see below for further discussion). Although MRU aims to offer both a full-time and a part-time TPEM program, only the part-time program has been executed so far. RT did not receive additional information during the meetings why so far no full-time students participate in the program.

In the discussions RT had with staff, one program graduate and two representatives from organisation working in the territorial planning field, RT also received more evidence of the extent to which the TPEM program relates to labour market demand for territorial planning and environmental management experts. RT members recognize, in an European context, the

demand for territorial planners with a social sciences and/or management background, operating as process managers of territorial planning projects. However, based on the information RT received during the meetings, RT is more sceptical about labour market prospects in Lithuania. The labour market survey conducted by the TPEM team shows that there certainly are opportunities for TPEM graduates on the labour market, but information is lacking whether the skills of program graduates match sufficiently with employer requirements.

However, the review of the SER and the interviews with MRU senior management and teaching staff also raised a number of concerns with the present status of the program. First, since the start of the program so far only a small number of students have participated in the program; due to the low student numbers MRU recently decided to offer the program only once in every two years. Second, so far only part-time students participate in the program. While the program management aims to offer a more research-focussed program, most of the part-time students seem to prefer a rather practical training (note: observation based on interview with only one student). Third, and perhaps most important, staff expertise seems to concentrate much more on environmental management and less on territorial planning. As a consequence, the attention for (practical) aspects of territorial planning is less than RT would expect for this program. Issues that typically should receive attention in a territorial planning program – according to the opinion of RT members and based on the content of similar long-standing programs in other European countries - (e.g. urban design, urban planning, transport planning, land management) receive relatively little attention in the program or not at all (based on program description in the SER and what RT heard during meetings). Fourth, since the program did not open for new students in 2016, planned actions for improvements have been delayed.

As a conclusion, RT believes that the TPEM program potentially addresses a relevant field of study that may foresee in future labour market demand for territorial planners. However, improvements must take place, to develop more focus in the program on territorial planning and to include a more planning practice-oriented approach in the program, particularly if the program continues to attract primarily or exclusively part-time students. To increase student numbers, RT recommends to MRU to pay attention to the options to offer a specialization (or courses) in territorial planning in the bachelor program (which may help to attract more full-time students for the master program).

2.2. Curriculum design

The Master's Program in the field of Territorial Planning meets, according to RT, the legal requirements. The program consists of nine compulsory study course subjects, consisting of 54 credits, which make 60% of the program. A further 6.7% of the program consists of an

optional elective subjects. The number of subjects studied during one semester does not exceed the maximum of five. Additionally RT comments that the program is dominated by environmental management subjects, which does not adequately seem to reflect the name of the program.

RT was informed during the visit that other courses which are not explicitly territorial planning nevertheless include content that extends across this remit. The GIS courses in particular were flagged in this regard. Despite this, the clear imbalance in the program was commented upon by parties that RT interviewed during its analysis, and reflected a general feeling that this disparity needed to be rectified. RT therefore recommends to reconsider the domination of environmental management subjects in the program and to add more territorial planning subjects.

During the visit RT was not able to judge the quality of the taught work produced by students but were happy to confirm that the content of the modules is consistent with a masters' level degree and appropriate to meeting the learning outcomes as they currently exist. The students that RT interviewed were also complimentary about the teaching. RT was very pleased to see the depth of environmental management expertise that is available to the program and how research active staff is using their research work to inform teaching. In addition, RT found during the visit that subjects are spread evenly over modules, while their themes are not repetitive. Finally, based on information gathered from both SER and the visit, RT believes that the content and methods of the subjects/modules are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. RT is content, therefore, that the program adequately reflects the latest thinking in environmental management, although this was far less apparent in the territorial planning field where expertise in the program staff is thin by comparison.

In addition to the taught elements, the degree features a Masters Thesis which constitutes 33.3% of the entire program. These theses were examined during the visit and the standard was generally agreed to be high. Again, however, the subject-matter is extremely biased towards environmental management at the expense of territorial planning as students understandably choose to pursue subjects that reflected the content of the previous taught elements, as well as the availability of expertise for supervision within the program. Again this situation seems to undermine the claim of the masters to be both a territorial planning and environmental management degree (which is the branch of the territorial planning field). RT strongly supports the program leaders aspiration to better shape the training and guidance for preparing the thesis so that it better reflects the needs of territorial planning as well as the broad social sciences. This should include discussion of research methods appropriate to the conduct of a research thesis in this field.

During RT visit there was much discussion about the need for territorial planning to be taught in an inter-disciplinary manner. RT strongly welcomes this, but questions its delivery in practice. In particular, RT remained concerned that territorial planning taught in isolation from other built environment disciplines (architecture, urban design, economic development, real estate, engineering, landscape design, and so forth) could not be truly inter-disciplinary. Whilst RT accepts that there is a clear case for planners with an advanced knowledge of environmental management and taught within a social-science perspective, RT feels that the program team should consider how students might be made better aware of the role of planning in relation to the other built environment disciplines and how a truly inter-disciplinary pedagogy might be fostered.

In conclusion, RT assesses the curriculum design as satisfactory. Though the program meets the legal requirements, RT is concerned about the somewhat unbalanced composition of the program, which is dominated by environmental management subjects. RT recommends, in line with the title of the program, to bring in more aspects of territorial planning in the program.

2.3. Teaching staff

The TPEM program is provided by staff members meeting legal requirements. The staff consists of 8 lecturers involved in the program (2 full professors, 3 associated professors, 2 lecturers holding a doctoral degree and 1 lecturer with long professional experience, but without a doctoral degree). It is difficult to assess exactly the student/teacher ratio due to fluctuating student numbers. In general, it can be stated that in absolute numbers the current staff is sufficient to provide the study program.

Staff members mainly have expertise in environmental management-related research. Professor Paulo Pereira particularly has a strong track record in this field and holds international reputation. Several staff members actively engage in international research projects. TPEM staff members also participate in the MRU Environmental Management Research Centre. The combination of expertise and international cooperation certainly makes a strong contribution to the quality of the TPEM program and adds a significant 'international flavour' to the teaching program. On the contrary, staff capacity in the field of territorial planning is rather limited. Practical territorial planning expertise, with regard to planning in Lithuania, is provided by one part-time lecturer (Gintautas Tiskus) (and seems to be highly appreciated by students).

RT found, based on SER and the visit, that the teaching staff of the program is involved in research directly related to the study program.

Although unfortunately RT was able to speak to the two members of the TPEM program management, one current student and one graduate only, RT got the impression that the

program runs satisfactory and that the staff is qualified to provide the program. Based on SER and the visit, RT found that Mykolas Romeris University creates sufficient conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the program. According to the SER, teaching staff turnover is able to ensure an adequate provision of the program. There was one complaint, however, from the student RT met, that due to staff turnovers, there were changes several times from supervisors for master thesis.

However, in line with what has already mentioned above, RT feels nevertheless that there is an unbalance in the present composition of the staff. To be able to offer more territorial planning-related modules in the program, MRU should consider extending the staff with a territorial planning background. Such a strategy should include mentoring of new staff and seminars or courses that would inspire and encourage the staff in general to develop in territorial planning-related fields.

In the SER, TPPEM program management mentions that it wants to mitigate the small number of staff in territorial planning by inviting (foreign) guest lecturers. Unfortunately, this initiative had to be postponed, because the program did not open in 2016.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

During the visit RT was taken on a tour of the university's estate and shown a number of typical teaching spaces, including large and small lecture rooms and the library. RT was furthermore able to read about the virtual, electronic and data resources at the disposal of students. RT was broadly satisfied with what was shown and confirms that the premises for studies are adequate in terms of both their size and quality and the teaching equipment is both up to date and appropriate to the program.

Students were particularly complimentary about the use of the MOODLE virtual learning platform felt that its use contrasted positively with some other institutions in Lithuania.

RT was told about the library resources available and was happy with what was seen. RT nevertheless notes that the library resources that it was told about and those that were seen related strongly to the environmental management side of the program and much less so to territorial planning in regards to which there seemed to be few specific books on offer and no dedicated section in the library. The program management has explained, however, that the university additionally offers a sufficient amount of e-books to students. However, since this is also a concern expressed in the Self Assessment Evaluation Report, the RT nevertheless recommends to consider the extension of books available in the library as well.

There is also an apparent lack of any studio spaces appropriate to the conduct of planning project work and group work. Whilst, if space is available, this is relatively easily

rectified, it is contrary to established international norms for the teaching of spatial planning and is likely to result in less effective teaching. This is a requirement that will become more obvious as the territorial planning components of the degree are expanded and as students focus more on the practices of planning.

Program management has further explained that the Faculty offers a special GIS laboratory with new ArcGIS software to its students. Though RT was not able to visit this auditorium (due to time constraints), the RT confirms the significance of such lab facilities and appreciates very much the availability of these sources to students.

In conclusion, RT found that Mykolas Romeris University has adequate arrangements for students' practice and that teaching materials are adequate and accessible.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The SER provides a clear overview of the study process and students' performance assessment. The admission requirements are well-founded and follow admission rules as set by Mykolas Romeris University. The students' admission procedure is also clear.

The principles of student performance assessment are clearly explained in the SER and follow Mykolas Romeris University regulations with respect to this matter. The students RT spoke too did not have any comments with respect to student performance assessment.

The program offers good opportunities for student participation in staff research; this is appreciated by RT. About 1/3 of the program is allocated to research activities, including social investigation methodology and preparation of the master's thesis. However, it wasn't entirely clear to the RT to what extent students actually participated in staff research (or choose to conduct their own research independently). Information with respect to this was missing in the SER and was not clarified during the visit.

The program has study evaluation procedures in place (updated in 2013). However, the SER does not contain clear results of student feedback / program evaluation by students. During the meeting it was explained that this is due to the low student numbers and the fact that only part-time students participate in the program that perhaps have less time (or commitment) to participate in evaluation procedures.

Mykolas Romeris University ensures an adequate level of academic and social support and offers a range of financial support to its students. The SER provides a clear overview of the available support to students. The SER also mentions good opportunities for students to participate in student mobility programs.

In the meeting with the program management RT was informed about the relatively low number of students participating in the program so far. According to the regulation Mykolas

Romeris University itself applies study programs can only start with a minimum of 15 students. Since this number of students could not be attracted so far on an annual basis, the university has decided to offer the program now only once in two years. The RT is concerned about this, because it seems to threaten the viability of the program on the longer term. There is also concern that projected improvement actions to attract more students (as stated in the SER) did not yet take place. This was confirmed by the program management. RT recommends to initiate additional marketing activities to attract more students.

Finally the RT has the opinion that the professional activities of program graduates seem to meet the expectations of the program management. However, clear evidence is missing, due to the low number of graduates from the program so far.

2.6. Programme management

Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the study programme are clearly allocated. Study programme administration acts by regulations which provide responsibility of every programme participant. The entire process of assuring study quality is coordinated by a group of quality management system supervision, discussing relevant issues of quality improvement as well as providing recommendations for organizers and stakeholders of studies. But in practice it is not yet entirely in place, because RT found that there is not any master plan (strategic document for the development of current programme) or improvement in place. The strategy must improve the programme and attract more full time student in midterm perspective.

Teachers are responsible for conformity of studies with changes within the sector of measurement engineering. Representatives of employers are responsible for study programme's conformity to labour market needs and adjustment of students' practical and general skills. Students' representative communicates students' expectations and ensures students' integration into study programme.

Information and feedback on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected (via questionnaires) and analysed; this was confirmed during the meetings. Surveys of students, graduates, employers and social partners are continually performed for the improvement of the study programme (proofs were given to RT). But after that any actions have been taken.

Unfortunately, the internal quality assurance measures apparently are not effective and efficient enough. Main evidences of the weakness are low number of students (no positive changes), low activity of students (no positive changes) and social partners, low professional

capacity in territorial planning (no positive changes), and no possibility to get licence (territorial planning). A general plan (road map) how to develop or change it is also lacking.

The programme offers a new approach to territorial planning processes in Lithuania. MRU tried to include more environmental and social factors to territorial planning. Globalisation, climate change, migration and other new factors have become more important in territorial planning. MRU is trying to include it to this programme and in general, RT finds this a good idea. For that reason RT recommends MRU to continue the program, but to improve and adjust the content, taking into account RT's recommendations.

2.7. Examples of excellence *

- Members of the staff of the TPEM program have a strong track record in environmental management research and hold international reputation in this field, demonstrated by highly valued and cited international publications and participation in international research projects.
- Staff members have both highly-qualified expertise and a high commitment to GIS teaching and its integration in the program, as a means to explore a range of topics in relation to territorial planning and environmental management

III.RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The aims and learning outcomes in the TPPEM program are clearly defined and are relevant to the fields of territorial planning and environmental management. However, in the way the program is executed the program management should develop a stronger orientation in the program on territorial planning, to distinguish the program sufficiently from environmental management programmes.

2. In order to extend the current staff's expertise in territorial planning issues in Lithuania, RT recommends the staff to discuss and develop a strategy for staff development in this direction. Such a strategy should include mentoring of new staff and seminars or courses that would inspire and encourage the staff in general to develop in territorial planning-related fields.

3. MRU should consider to support this stronger orientation on territorial planning by a clear strategy and possibly new staff investments. This strategy should pay attention to the options to offer a specialization (or courses) in territorial planning in the bachelor program which may help to attract more full-time students for the master program and to invest in new staff with expertise in territorial planning.

4. Since the TPPEM program aims to fill in a niche in the territorial planning labour market, but is still rather unknown to potential students, MRU should consider to develop a more effective marketing strategy to promote the program to future students. MRU and TPPEM program management should discuss minimum student numbers for the coming years to be able to offer a viable program.

5. TPPEM should discuss, develop, and implement a plan for closer cooperation with social partners and alumni in order to enhance further development of the program and to incorporate 'planning practices' in the program. Social partners should also be involved in discussing and possibly improving the position of graduates in the labour market.

6. MRU should discuss with the responsible organisations the issue of qualification of graduates from the program as a territorial planner, since graduates at the moment do neither qualify as engineer, nor as architect, which may threaten their future position on the labour market.

IV. SUMMARY

The MA program on Territorial Planning and Environmental Management offers a unique academic program in territorial planning, with additional knowledge of environmental management, within a social science perspective. On the basis of the SER and the site visit, the evaluation team noted the following strengths and weaknesses. Below are also given some recommendations, which would help the TPEM program to improve.

The aims of the programme and its learning outcomes are based on academic and professional requirements and take into account the niche demand in the Lithuanian labour market for territorial planners with a focus on process management of planning projects. The courses with respect to environmental management provide students with additional expertise that can be useful in their future roles as territorial planners. However, given the apparent unbalance in the program (territorial planning versus environmental management), the quality of the program would strongly benefit from a stronger focus on and more attention to territorial planning in general and territorial planning practices in Lithuania in particular.

In the curriculum the courses with respect to environmental management and GIS are strong. However, the attention that is given in the curriculum to territorial planning is felt to be insufficient at the moment. During the visit evaluation team was not able to judge the quality of the taught work produced by students but evaluation team is happy to confirm that the content of the modules is consistent with a masters level degree and appropriate to meeting the learning outcomes as they currently exist. Evaluation team is content, therefore, that the program adequately reflects the latest thinking in environmental management, although this was far less apparent in the territorial planning field where expertise in the program staff is thin by comparison.

In addition to the taught elements, the degree features a Master Thesis which constitutes 33.3% of the entire program. These theses were examined during the visit and the standard was generally agreed to be high.

Regarding facilities and learning resources the expert team notes that the library resources related strongly to the environmental management side of the program and much less so to territorial planning in regards to which there seemed to be few specific books on offer and no dedicated section in the library. Whilst to some degree this will be mitigated by the availability of electronic resources, expert team notes that this is also a concern expressed in the Self Assessment Evaluation Report, and should be urgently rectified.

There is also an apparent lack of any studio spaces appropriate to the conduct of planning project work and group work. Whilst, if space is available, this is relatively easily rectified, it is contrary to established international norms for the teaching of spatial planning and

is likely to result in less effective teaching. This is a requirement that will become more obvious as the territorial planning components of the degree are expanded and as students focus more on the practices of planning.

The number and qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate in academic terms in general. The TPED team's research expertise mainly concentrates on environmental management, with a strong internationally recognized reputation in environmental management research of the head of the team and a good track record of other members as well. However, the team lacks at the moment sufficient expertise in territorial planning and faces difficulties in providing sufficient planning practice-oriented education.

Facilities and learning resources offered by MRU seem to be of good quality and high standards, including class rooms and the library. However, there seemed to be few specific books on offer with respect to territorial planning. Expert group noted that this is also a concern expressed in the SER and should be urgently rectified. In addition to that Evaluation team found that there is an apparent lack of any studio spaces appropriate to the conduct of planning project work and group work. This is a requirement that will become more obvious as the territorial planning components of the program are going to be extended.

Study process and students' performance assessment are well defined and explained in the SER and follow the regulations as set by Mykolas Romeris University. Although Expert group was only to speak to one student and one graduate during our visit, the team got the impression that participating students are pleased with the program offered. There is a concern, however, about the low student numbers. Moreover, the expert team hasn't been able to review any form of students' feedback on the program.

Programme management operates well and is linked well to the Strategic Activities Plan of Mykolas Romeris University. The program follows a set of well-defined quality regulations of Mykolas Romeris University. The expert team, however, wants to express its concerns regarding the follow-up of the projected improvement actions as set by programme management. The expert team recommends that programme management should put a higher level of urgency to the adjustments in the program and to the activities to attract more students.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme TERRITORIAL PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (state code – 621S30001) at MYKOLAS ROMERIS 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	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
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. Erwin van der Krabben
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Matthew Carmona
	Audrius Petkevičius
	Simonas Pusvaškis

**MYKOLO ROMERIO UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ
PROGRAMOS TERITORIJŲ PLANAVIMAS IR APLINKOS VALDYMAS
(VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621S30001)
2017-02-14 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-24 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

MYKOLO ROMERIO UNIVERSITETO studijų programa *TERITORIJŲ PLANAVIMAS IR APLINKOS VALDYMAS* (valstybinis kodas – 621S30001) 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	3
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)

<...>

2.7. Gerosios praktikos pavyzdžiai *

- TPAV programos dėstytojai yra ypač pasižymėję aplinkos vadybos moksliniuose tyrimuose ir demonstruoja tarptautinę reputaciją šioje srityje gerai vertinamomis ir cituojamomis tarptautinėmis publikacijomis ir dalyvaudami tarptautinių mokslinių tyrimų projektuose.
- Dėstytojai turi ir aukšto lygio kvalifikaciją ir yra įsipareigoję GIS mokymui ir įtraukimui į programą, kaip kad priemonę tiriant įvairias temas, sietinas su teritorijų planavimu ir aplinkos vadyba.

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Magistro teritorijų planavimo ir aplinkos valdymo programa yra unikali akademinė teritorijų planavimo programa, kurioje taip pat suteikiama papildomų aplinkos valdymo žinių iš socialinių mokslų perspektyvos. Vadovaudamasi SS ir įvykusių vizitu, vertinimo grupė pastebėjo toliau įvardijamas stiprybes ir silpnybes. Toliau taip pat pateikiamos rekomendacijos, kurios padės tobulinti TPAV studijų programą.

Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai grindžiami akademiniais ir profesiniais reikalavimais, jie sudaryti atsižvelgiant į Lietuvos darbo rinkos teritorijų planuotojų paklausą, daugiau dėmesio skiriant projektų planavimo proceso valdymui. Su aplinkos valdymu susijusiuose dalykuose studentams teikiamos papildomos žinios, kurios gali būti naudingos jiems ateityje dirbant teritorijų planavimo specialistais. Tačiau atsižvelgiant į akivaizdų programos disbalansą (tarp teritorijų planavimo ir aplinkos valdymo), studijų programos kokybė labai pagerėtų, jei daugiau dėmesio būtų skiriama teritorijų planavimui apskritai ir ypač teritorijų planavimo praktikai Lietuvoje.

Programoje veiksmingai vykdomi dalykai, susiję su aplinkos valdymu ir GIS. Tačiau programos sandaroje teritorijų planavimui skiriamas dėmesys nepakankamas. Per vizitą nebuvo galima įvertinti dėstomų dalykų studentų darbo kokybės, tačiau vertinimo grupė patvirtina, kad modulių turinys atitinka magistro laipsnio lygį ir dabartinius studijų rezultatus. Vertinimo grupė yra patenkinta, kad programa atitinkamai atspindi naujausias aplinkos valdymo idėjas, nors tai buvo ne taip akivaizdu teritorijų planavimo srityje, kur programos personalo kvalifikacija palyginti yra kur kas silpnesnė.

Studentai privalo mokytis ne tik dėstomų dalykų, bet ir parašyti magistro darbą, kuris sudaro 33,3 % visos programos. Nagrinėjant šiuos magistro darbus vizito metu buvo nustatytas aukštas jų lygis.

Vertindami materialiuosius išteklius ekspertai pažymi, kad bibliotekos ištekliai buvo daugiau susiję su aplinkos valdymu ir kur kas mažiau su teritorijų planavimu; su pastarąja sritimi buvo susijusios tik kelios specializuotos knygos, o bibliotekoje šiai sričiai net nėra sukurtas atskiras skyrius. Nors iš dalies šį skirtumą sumažins prieinami elektroniniai ištekliai, ekspertų grupė mano, kad tai kelia susirūpinimą, kuris buvo išreikštas savianalizės suvestinėje ir šią padėtį reikia nedelsiant keisti.

Taip pat akivaizdžiai trūksta bet kokių dirbtuvių erdvių, tinkamų planavimo projektų darbui ir grupiniam darbui atlikti. Nors, jei būtų galima rasti erdvę, šį aspektą galima lengvai

pakeisti, tai prieštarauja nustatytoms tarptautinėms erdvinio planavimo dėstymo normoms ir tai lemia, kad dėstymas yra mažiau veiksmingas. Tai reikalavimas, kuris taps labiau akivaizdus, kai bus plačiau dėstomas teritorijų planavimo dalykas ir kai studentai labiau koncentruosis į planavimo praktiką.

Apskritai, dėstančiojo personalo skaičius ir kvalifikacija atitinka akademines sąlygas. TPAV programos komandos mokslinių tyrimų kvalifikacija daugiausia susijusi su aplinkos valdymu, jos vadovas turi gerą aplinkos valdymo tyrimų reputaciją tarptautinėje arenoje, kiti nariai taip pat turi profesinės patirties. Tačiau komandai šiuo metu trūksta teritorijų planavimo srities kvalifikacijos ir susiduriama su sunkumais teikiant pakankamą praktinio planavimo ugdymą.

MRU materialieji išteklių, įskaitant auditorijas ir biblioteką, yra geros kokybės ir atitinka aukštus standartus. Tačiau siūloma per mažai specializuotų knygų, susijusių su teritorijų planavimu. Ekspertų grupė pastebėjo, kad ši problema buvo įtraukta į SS ir ją reikia kuo skubiau keisti. Be to, vertinimo grupė sužinojo, kad akivaizdžiai trūksta bet kokios studijos erdvės, kuri būtų tinkama planavimo projektų darbams ir grupiniam darbui atlikti. Tai reikalavimas, kuris taps akivaizdesnis, kai bus plačiau dėstomas teritorijų planavimo dalykas.

Studijų proceso ir studentų darbo vertinimas SS yra gerai apibrėžti ir paaiškinti, taip pat jie vykdomi pagal Mykolo Romerio universiteto nustatytas taisykles. Nors per vizitą ekspertų grupė galėjo pasikalbėti tik su vienu studentu ir vienu absolventu, susidarė įspūdis, kad dalyvaujantys studentai yra patenkinti teikiama programa. Visgi, nerimą kelia mažas studentų skaičius. Be to, ekspertų grupei nebuvo suteikta galimybė peržiūrėti jokių studentų atsiliepimų apie programą.

Programos vadyba veikia puikiai ir aiškiai vykdoma pagal Mykolo Romerio universiteto strateginės veiklos planą. Studijų programa vykdoma pagal aiškiai nustatytas Mykolo Romerio universiteto kokybės taisykles. Visgi, ekspertų grupė nori išreikšti susirūpinimą programos vadovybės nustatytų tobulinimo veiksmų įgyvendinimu. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja programos vadovybei skubiau koreguoti programą ir įgyvendinti veiklą, skirtą studentams pritraukti.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. TPAV studijų programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai aiškiai apibrėžti ir atitinka teritorijų planavimo ir aplinkos valdymo sritis. Tačiau ją vykdydama programos vadovybė turėtų labiau orientuotis į teritorijų planavimą, kad programa būtų pakankamai atskirta nuo aplinkos valdymo programų.

2. Siekiant praplėsti esamų darbuotojų teritorijų planavimo srities kvalifikaciją Lietuvoje, ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja personalui apsvarstyti ir sukurti šios krypties personalo tobulinimosi strategiją. Tokioje strategijoje turėtų būti numatyta, kaip mokyti naujus darbuotojus, taip pat, kokie seminarai ir kursai bendrai padėtų ir paskatintų personalą tobulintis su teritorijų planavimu susijusiose srityse.
3. MRU turėtų apsvarstyti labiau paremti orientaciją į teritorijų planavimą, sukuriant aiškia strategiją ir galimai investuojant į naujus darbuotojus. Strategijoje reikia numatyti galimybę bakalauro studijų programoje teikti teritorijų planavimo specializaciją (ar dalykus), kurie galėtų padėti į magistro studijų programą pritraukti daugiau nuolatinį studijų studentų ir investuoti į naujus darbuotojus, turinčius teritorijų planavimo kvalifikaciją.
4. Nors TPAV studijų programa siekiama užpildyti teritorijų planavimo nišą darbo rinkoje, tačiau ji potencialiems studentams vis dar nepakankamai žinoma, MRU turėtų sukurti veiksmingesnę rinkodaros strategiją, kad programa būtų reklamuojama būsimiems studentams. MRU ir TPAV programos vadovybė turėtų aptarti ir nuspręsti, koks mažiausias studentų skaičius bus leistinas ateinančiais metais, kad programa būtų perspektyvi.
5. TPAV turėtų aptarti, sukurti ir įgyvendinti planą, kaip artimiau bendradarbiauti su socialiniais partneriais ir absolventais, kad programa būtų labiau vystoma ir į ją būtų galima įtraukti „planavimo praktiką“. Socialinius partnerius taip pat reikia įtraukti į diskusijas ir galimai gerinti absolventų poziciją darbo rinkoje.
6. MRU su atsakingomis organizacijomis turėtų aptarti šios studijų programos absolventų kvalifikacijos kaip teritorijų planuotojo klausimą, nes šiuo metu absolventai neturi nei inžinieriaus, nei architekto kvalifikacijos, o tai gali jiems sukelti nepatogumų darbo rinkoje.

<...>

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)