



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Šiaulių valstybinės kolegijos  
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS INFORMACIJOS PASLAUGOS**  
*(valstybinis kodas - 653P10001)*  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT**  
**OF INFORMATION SERVICES** *(state code - 653P10001)*  
**STUDY PROGRAMME**  
at Šiauliai State College

1. **Prof. Dr. Johannes Bardoel** (team leader), *academic,*
  2. **Mr. Andrew David Dawson**, *academic,*
  3. **Prof. Dr. Triin Vihalemm**, *academic,*
  4. **Mr. Mindaugas Grajauskas**, *representative of social partners,*
  5. **Ms. Meda Keleckaitė**, *students' representative.*
- Evaluation coordinator – Ms. Dovilė Stonkutė.**

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language – English

Vilnius  
2015

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Informacijos paslaugos</i>
Valstybinis kodas	653P10001
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Informacijos paslaugos
Studijų programos rūšis	Koleginės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (3), iššęstinė (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	180
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Informacijos paslaugų profesinis bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2012-05-09

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Information Services</i>
State code	653P10001
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Information Services
Type of the study programme	College studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (3), part-time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	180
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Professional Bachelor in Information Services
Date of registration of the study programme	9 <sup>th</sup> May, 2012

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

# CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
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
<b>II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	6
2.2. Curriculum design .....	6
2.3. Teaching staff .....	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources .....	8
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	9
2.6. Programme management .....	11
2.7. Examples of excellence .....	12
<b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>IV. SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Background of the evaluation process

The evaluation of on-going study programmes is based on the **Methodology for evaluation of Higher Education study programmes**, approved by Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereafter – SKVC).

The evaluation is intended to help higher education institutions to constantly improve their study programmes and to inform the public about the quality of studies.

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: 1) *self-evaluation and self-evaluation report prepared by Higher Education Institution (hereafter – HEI)*; 2) *visit of the review team at the higher education institution*; 3) *production of the evaluation report by the review team and its publication*; 4) *follow-up activities*.

On the basis of external evaluation report of the study programme SKVC takes a decision to accredit study programme either for 6 years or for 3 years. If the programme evaluation is negative such a programme is not accredited.

The programme is **accredited for 6 years** if all evaluation areas are evaluated as “very good” (4 points) or “good” (3 points).

The programme is **accredited for 3 years** if none of the areas was evaluated as “unsatisfactory” (1 point) and at least one evaluation area was evaluated as “satisfactory” (2 points).

The programme is **not accredited** if at least one of evaluation areas was evaluated as “unsatisfactory” (1 point).

### 1.2. General

The Application documentation submitted by the HEI follows the outline recommended by the SKVC. Along with the self-evaluation report and annexes, the following additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	The list of rotation order
2.	Document regarding rotation
3.	Description of subjects’ achievement evaluation
4.	Regulations of studies
5.	Documents regarding research surveys
6.	Evaluation report of the programme <i>Library and Information Studies</i> (2012)

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

Šiauliai State College is a regional college located in northern Lithuania and was established in 2002 as a higher non-university school, created from a merger and expansion of the pre-existing Šiauliai Higher Medical School and the Šiauliai Higher Technical School. It is the only State College in the north of Lithuania. It primarily draws its students from that region, and currently comprises approximately 2300 students supported by approximately 260 teachers. The College participates in the principal academic networks in the Baltic region and Europe and has collaboration agreements with universities in a number of countries. It also participates with other European universities in the framework of the EU student mobility programme Erasmus +. It also undertakes vocational projects, and carries out applied research.

The Information Services study programme reviewed here is taught by the Department of Humanities, a department of the Faculty of Business and Technologies in the College. The department is assisted in its teaching of the programme by contributions from a number of other divisions within the College, specifically the Library and Self-Study Centre, the Student Admission and Career Centre, the Information Technology Centre, the Academic Mobility and Project Management Department, and the Study Record Department. The programme is stated as having been established in 2012, therefore technically this is its first review, although it appears to be largely derived from a preceding programme of library and information studies which has now been decommissioned.

This report relates to the assessment of the undergraduate programme in Information Services (hereafter referred to as IS) by the Review Team (hereafter referred to as RT).

Language issues:

Substantial documentation was made available to the RT prior to and during its visit but not all of the material was in English, despite this being the working language of the RT. The quality of English expression in the SER is frequently poor, to the point of causing confusion. Additional supplementary documentation requested by the team was only provided in Lithuanian. According to the native Lithuanian speakers on the RT, verbal translations in English given during the visit often contained minor but substantive differences from the responses actually given in Lithuanian by the representatives, which could have led to misunderstanding. Further, the English abstracts supplied with the student theses were often very short and appeared to be poor summaries of the actual content. All these language factors made the job of objectively assessing the programme more difficult, and would benefit from considerable improvement.

#### **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 *16th September, 2015*.

- 1. Prof. Dr. Johannes Bardoel (team leader)**, *emeritus professor in Communication Science of the Radboud University of Nijmegen, researcher at the Amsterdam School of Communications Research (ASCoR), as part of the Department of Communication Science of the University of Amsterdam, Netherlands.*
- 2. Mr. Andrew David Dawson**, *Director of International Relations and Projects, Director of Studies, Senior Teaching Fellow at the Department of Information Studies, University College London, United Kingdom.*
- 3. Prof. Dr. Triin Vihalemm**, *Professor at the Institute of Journalism, Faculty of Social Sciences and Education, University of Tartu, Estonia.*
- 4. Mr. Mindaugas Grajauskas**, *Consultant and manager of gamified products, OVC Consulting, Lithuania.*
- 5. Ms. Meda Keleckaitė**, *student of Kaunas University of Technology PhD study programme Economics, Lithuania.*

**Evaluation coordinator – Ms. Dovilė Stonkutė.**

## **II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS**

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

The RT commends the stated and publicly available programme aims (as stated in the SER, Table 3, including particular mention of innovation, understanding of management structures, information society, digital resources, and labour market integration) which not only appear to be a good fit with the stated needs of stakeholders as reported in meetings, but which RT considers to be close to excellent and appropriately aspirational for both the development of practitioners in this field and the current and future needs of employers in general.

RT does feel however that the stated learning outcomes, whilst well-intentioned, are not well formulated as they are very difficult to measure (e.g. “Applying the strategies of the development of information society“, “learn continuously to adapt to change“). Staff could not give clear specific examples of how this would be actually done in practice when asked. There is reference in section 6 of the SER to a lack of a “training standard for information service professionals“, and the use of the Lithuanian Classification of Occupations to establish the noticeable focus on “archivists and curators... librarians and related information professionals“. The management group identified the programme’s market as “european“ but none of the staff groups interviewed had considered using existing european or american professional standards (e.g. the Professional Standards Knowledge Base of the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (UK), or the Standards Manual of the American Library Association). This rather insular approach is a weakness and wider consultation of such appropriate existing professional standards might have enabled a more easily measured set of learning outcomes.

Further, this focus on “traditional“ information professions (“memory institutions“) is seen to be limiting the choice of detailed content and the teaching of more widely applicable information management skills for commercial and industrial organisations, which are also potential employers of graduates of this programme and who are a huge potential market. Similarly, consultation with the aforementioned existing standards might also have helped here.

The (translated) name of the programme in English - “Information Services“ – is considered to be misleading for the programme in its current form. This name commonly implies a focus on computing services rather than information work, with a high emphasis on computing skills rather than information organisation skills, and although some technical skills have been appropriately included in the current content, they are neither sufficiently broad nor complex to suggest the current title. RT would suggest the title “Information Management“ as being both more appropriate and also more indicative of both the current content and the broader range of work this programme’s stakeholders aspire towards.

With the above borne in mind, the aims and objectives are otherwise broadly consistent with the type and level of studies and qualification offered.

### ***2.2. Curriculum design***

As far as it is possible for the RT to ascertain, the programme complies with the legal requirements for higher education study programmes in Lithuania. The volumes of credits, spread of application across subjects, general relevance of subjects included, practical placement and thesis preparation all appear to match the stated requirements. Staff and students reported use of a range of teaching and learning styles and methods appropriate to content, including

lectures, practicals, group work, tutorials etc.. There is no undue overlap of content between courses, and content presented is appropriate to this area and level of study – as far as it goes.

However, as alluded to in the previous section, the RT questions whether the range of content covered by the programme is truly sufficient to achieve the aims and learning outcomes, particularly in a European environment, and on the broader scale which some members of both the SER team and the stakeholder group stated that they aspired towards.

The RT were particularly concerned by the apparent lack of reference to external standards in information work (as mentioned in 2.1 above) and the absence of both records management and information technology topics other than where directly related to the operations of traditional libraries, archives and museums, which is clearly perceived in practice as the active market: the great majority of stakeholders RT spoke to came from these sectors rather than any other business or entrepreneurial areas. Modern information science/management is however highly applicable (and critically important) to all kinds of organisations and the exclusion of non-traditional environments is a major weakness in the programme's present scope.

The impression of RT is very much that despite this being presented as a “new“ programme, it is very much the child of the earlier LIS programme which has just been discontinued. Indeed RT considers that it would have been far more appropriate (and helpful to the audit) to present materials and reviews from that programme and the process of transition to this new programme as a continuum, although this might have highlighted some weaknesses in process which RT subsequently uncovered by investigation. The RT had to discover the existence of the 2009 and 2011 projects and documents relating to the old programme, and the previous experts' report (in 2012, [SVK\\_bibliotekos\\_informaciniu\\_istekliu\\_valdymas\\_2012](#), only provided to RT in Lithuanian) which amongst other things had as specific recommendations, to specify the programme's aim, to compare the programme's objectives with the European documents, to change / correct the list of compulsory subjects and to ensure that the contents of the study subjects would achieve the intended learning outcomes, all of which are pertinent to the discussion here.

Dealing with the change from the old programme to the new one, inter alia RT find the revision of objectives being no more than the substitution of the word “Communication“ for “Library“ in 2/3 of cases examined (23 of 35) in the above documents. The meeting with staff confirmed a sensible framework for the redevelopment (investigation of the needs of labor market, followed by redefining the aim of the study programme and learning outcomes, re designing the curriculum of the study programme, and organizing / hiring the needed teaching expertise to fulfil the curriculum). Whilst RT applauds the underlying attempt to extend the old programme to encompass more areas and some technology, it does not in our view as experts go far enough in breadth in either of these aspects. RT noted the introduction of a new Information Technologies course but when asked about technological content, the response from both the staff and students focused around use of library and archive management systems, databases and searching. RT saw little evidence of close engagement with important underlying technology such as XML (or even XHTML) or the semantic web, or significant investigation or evaluation of the role of social media and other non-traditional forms of information communication, which are all very much critical current topics in the field. The students also voiced a desire to have more broad skill teaching, citing project management as a particular example they would like more teaching on. The LOs of the programme are highly optimistic and not properly covered by this curriculum, which remains more about library, archive and museum studies, primarily oriented around traditional libraries, with insufficient involvement from business representatives, despite the LOs stating that the graduates are able to operate independently in the business environment as well as in the environment of libraries, museums and other memory institutions.

RT therefore considers that the programme would benefit from further review and extension in terms of subject breadth and technical depth in order to adequately reflect the full range of modern information science/management practice, and to better achieve its aims, particularly those voiced in staff and stakeholder meetings, and with relation to business information needs.

### ***2.3. Teaching staff***

As far as the RT can ascertain, the staff appear to meet legal requirements. The RT noted the high number of teaching staff with practical and/or professional experience which RT feels is both appropriate and necessary for teaching in this field, and that seven new (and younger) members of staff had been recruited as part of the reorganisation pertaining to this programme, particularly to expand archives and museum expertise, though pure technical teachers were not prevalent. The overall level and balance of staff for what is currently being taught appear to be appropriate, with good range of interests and levels of expertise exhibited through the cohort during interviews with the RT, and all staff having at least 3 years practical work experience in their taught fields (SER table 7). Staff seemed very supportive of each other and gave good verbal evidence of collaborations and peer support, as well as citing good relations with stakeholders and the levels of formative support they received from them, which was subsequently confirmed by stakeholders, and which RT particularly commends. Staff student ratios as far as RT could determine accurately (identifying FTEs was not straightforward due to the many part time participants but the figure per student of 1:16 in section 50 of the SER is accepted) were reasonable and the great majority of students reported no difficulties in gaining access to staff for support.

Staff were highly positive about the levels of support they received from the institution generally for their own development; statements in the meeting specifically mentioned how administration was “very supportive“ and that “everybody is constantly improving“ as a result of the supportive environment, which includes e.g. conference attendance, training in teaching technology use and opportunities for travel abroad (see SER section 54, confirmed by participants – figures of “60 conferences, 120 workshops, 7 placements, ... 95 trainings“ are noted). When asked about formal research however most of the staff present were unable to give examples of recent peer-reviewed contributions, although there were many clear links with professional practice. Whilst the RT appreciates that this is a College, not a University, and that the staff are well-engaged with the stakeholder community, RT would expect to see a more active engagement with academic research than was evidenced.

### ***2.4. Facilities and learning resources***

In general the range and availability of facilities and resources to the staff and students which the RT viewed on their visit appears good. Physical space is seemingly abundant and in good repair; classrooms are well-sized and adequately equipped with presentation technology which is broadly up-to-date. RT saw good provision of student workspace both individually and for groups. Computer rooms likewise appear numerous, appropriately sized and well-equipped.

College library facilities are also housed in a suitable and pleasant environment: the physical resources for the course appeared to be quite limited however, with a very small physical bookstock, although a range of electronic materials (primarily in the form of databases rather than electronic books) is also available and supports external access. It should be noted that most of the students RT spoke to complained of a shortage of material in Lithuanian in particular. The



RT noted the availability of numerous library and archive management systems for training and practical use, which are commended as sound pedagogical support for that area of study.

The RT also noted the availability of Moodle (and its promotion) as the main Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) for the programme. Most staff indicated that they mounted their material on Moodle and used it as a primary teaching support tool, but some reported a preference for using Google apps. Although not essential, it might be more efficient for both staff and, particularly, students if Moodle were used more consistently across all courses.

RT notes the use of Videoconferencing to allow participation at a distance and commends the principle; however its current use in practice as described to the RT appears primarily to be limited to allowing a physically remote guest to “lecture“ to assembled students at a distance. RT would certainly encourage using this method to broaden the range of teachers and expertise being made available to the students remotely, but would suggest that a far greater use of this kind of technology, e.g. proper multisite videoconferencing (as opposed to “lecture casting“), electronic discussion groups/tutorials, and greater use of interactive communication technologies generally, could be used not only to improve the quality of teaching and learning, but also as an appropriate element of information technology for Information Science/Management students to learn about as tools to be used in the world of work.

Arrangements for practice are undertaken with a high degree of interaction with stakeholders, which was confirmed by staff, students and stakeholders alike; stakeholders are involved at all stages in the planning, execution and review of practice participation. Students are involved in the selection of their practices, and parallel practices are often arranged for the purpose of comparison. Overseas practice is also arranged, though not all students have the opportunity to experience this, primarily due to costs, and personal circumstances (e.g. part time working commitments at home).

### ***2.5. Study process and students‘ performance assessment***

The RT noted the change to admission scoring (incompletely reported in the SER s84, with a note that the maximum possible score reduced from 20.6 to 10) which had taken place in the current year: this made direct comparison less easy but it would seem that over the three years of intake (SER Table 9) there has been a slight degradation in quality (the reported mean being 14.75 in 2012-13, 13.22 in 2013-24, and 2.94 [later stated in meetings to be 4.34] in 2015), although within prescribed bounds.

As far as the RT could ascertain the organisation of study process facilitates an adequate provision of the programme for the achievement of the learning outcomes. As noted in 2.4 above, there is a good degree of interaction between College, students and stakeholders in assigning practice (SER section 91, corroborated by all parties). Mechanisms are in place to encourage feedback both formal and informal from stakeholders and although there is only anecdotal evidence to support this being truly systematic and universally applied, the RT is satisfied that it is sufficient, particularly in view of the commitment and evident active participation of stakeholders spoken to. Students mostly reported a high level of satisfaction with the way practice was handled, and encouragement to participate in research.

Ample opportunity is provided for students to travel abroad (e.g. via Erasmus) and a good level of take-up (12 students in 2014 according to SER s104) is evidenced. Range of actual destinations is reported by the students as a little limited (Latvia, Wildau and Porto being the only reported destinations) but nevertheless students mostly reported satisfaction with this aspect

of their education. Similarly both staff and students reported a good level of interaction in the context of collaborative working, and the students reported participating in a range of extra-curricular and social activities outside formal classes (e.g. trips, events) and receiving good levels of support for both social and academic activities)

As far as the RT could ascertain the assessment system is publically available. Students and staff described a quite clear understanding of assessment criteria even where this varied on an individual basis, and students reported high levels of satisfaction with the feedback they received, which often featured face-to-face explanation. SER Sections 97 & 115 (et seq) state that “Students’ learning outcomes are analysed“ but the administration team confirmed that this “analysis“ was only a correlation of summative marks, and students did report that on some courses the summative mark was all that was provided by way of feedback. Quality formative feedback is very important to learning development and undue focus and reliance on summative figures can be misleading. The RT would suggest that best practice in this area be applied throughout and more formative feedback and real analysis of “assessing learning outcomes“ (rather than just counting marks) takes place.

The RT would in particular like to commend the use of requiring some pieces of work done prior to the final thesis to be vocally defended, as practice for the final thesis defence. This was reported by some staff, and is a method which could be more widely implemented to assist student preparation for the formal defence.

It was problematic for the RT to judge the quality of final theses as they were written in Lithuanian with only a summary abstract in English, so only a very small sample could be properly reviewed by the Lithuanian speakers. Overall the level of work and consistency appeared to be appropriate and marks applied consistent. Although compliant with the prescribed scheme, the RT queries the credit value assigned to the Thesis: both staff and students, when asked, commented that the proportion of credit for this assignment, relative to the amount of time and effort which had to be committed to it for successful completion, was very low (9 credits), and it is the view of the RT that this level of credit value does not appropriately reflect the workload or intellectual effort input.

Stakeholder employers reported a high level of satisfaction with the abilities of students, and it is clear from speaking to them that they both value and support the programme. Only four graduates were available for interview: of these three were working in libraries and the fourth in general management in the construction industry. This latter person said that his general training had been useful for the job he was currently doing and had wide applicability. Unfortunately RT saw no examples of graduate who were undertaking active information work in industry, commerce or other non-traditional workplaces. Current students reported that they mostly considered that “information“ was the focus of their work, not “libraries“, but it was telling that the great majority of them had done practice in traditional library settings. They generally reported satisfaction with the appropriateness of content on the programme, but there was some degree of uncertainty voiced as to whether the range of skills they were learning would give them the broadest choice of work environment when they graduated (which is something the RT would concur with). Specific subjects mentioned by past and present students as needing expansion included psychology and communications, and in particular project management, and a greater focus on information management was mentioned by some stakeholders (which the RT would definitely support).

## ***2.6. Programme management***

As previously referred above, particularly in section 2.2, RT feels that this programme is clearly a revised continuation of the old LIS programme rather than a truly new programme, and RT considers the decision to present it as the latter to have been both inappropriate and unhelpful to the review process, and could be taken to suggest a lack of true quality thinking on behalf of management. With that said, RT nevertheless commends the fact that revision has taken place, as it was clearly needed, and a broadening out of the programme is entirely wise, even if in the view of RT this process has not gone far enough. The impression formed from the interviews with management, SER team and staff is one of a programme which has a commendably high level of stakeholder involvement and commitment, and that there is a clear indication that the stakeholders (particularly in the form of a few key individuals) are the driving force behind the improvements. This is a good thing, but RT would like to see more evidence of a more proactive approach from management itself. A good example of this would be the fact that the aims and learning outcomes which were (re)formulated in 2012 (SER, section 7) heavily involved the stakeholders, but resulted in documents which were largely simply re-edits of the originals (see 2.2 above) and which have not been formally reviewed since then, despite the noted “lack of feedback when evaluating learning outcomes“ (SER section 7), on the basis that students would not graduate until 2015. This lack of formal review was confirmed in interviews with management and staff. It seems to the RT that much useful information might have been gained from the new cohorts’ experiences as they progressed and they progressed, and that it would have been helpful from a quality assurance perspective to have instituted some form of ongoing interim review, to catch any problems at the earliest opportunity. To be fair, some staff did report that issues arising from student feedback were considered, but the concern of RT here is for the lack of apparent formalised quality management. Another example of this possibly superficial management involvement is the lack of anything other than summative statistical analysis of learning outcomes noted in 2.5 above. The SER overall is quite weak, being formulaic, poorly expressed (at least in the translation provided) and lacking in real hard self-critical analysis: the strengths and weaknesses tables are a good example of this, where in no case is more than one “weakness“ identified, and even then many of them are very trite and superficial (e.g., again, those for section 1 where lack of feedback to evaluate outcomes “due to lack of graduates“ is the only weakness cited).

With regard to student surveys, there was clear evidence provided by staff and students alike of the consistent use of survey tools to gather information on the student experience. What was somewhat less clear was evidence that appropriate and consistent action had been taken as a result of such information being gathered: RT heard some instances of issues being acted upon, but also others (from students) not apparently being acted upon. Even if decisions are properly made that action is not appropriate in response to issues raised, it is very important that the reasons for this are clearly communicated if the quality circle is to be completed.

The RT commends the constant high level of stakeholder involvement in the programme. There was clear evidence that all stakeholder classes are keen to participate in the programme’s development and that good opportunities to do so have been provided and taken advantage of. Particularly encouraging is the sense of vision shown by employers, staff and students alike in starting to see information work as being broader (and more technical) than its more traditional library-oriented origins. However, the RT feels that this transition and breadth of vision still needs further nurturing and expansion if it is truly to be representative of current modern trends in information work, and that at present this vision is not translating into a truly 21st century programme of study in the field, and management need to take continuing action to ensure this transition can be completed.

## **2.7. Examples of excellence**

The RT feels that the level of stakeholder involvement in this programme is worthy of particular recognition: not only because it is so pervasive and beneficial, appearing and assisting in everything from programme design through practical experience to feedback and remote teaching via videoconferencing, but also because it is clearly providing a driving force and vision which is clearly helping the programme to improve. Whilst practitioner involvement in programmes is commonplace, the level, pervasiveness and effectiveness of its application here is genuinely exceptional, even given the relative lack of involvement of the business sector.

## **III. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Strong consideration is given to changing the name of the programme to “Information Management” to better reflect its true and intended content, and to avoid confusion with more technical computing programmes in the European market.
2. That greater use of practice standards already developed by other nations in the field (particularly those from the US and UK) be referred to in defining appropriate aims, objectives and learning outcomes for the programme in order to increase competitiveness in external markets.
3. That in conjunction with (2) above, the learning outcomes and curriculum of the programme be further reviewed to ensure that the broadest and most appropriate scope of information skills are included, in order to better suit the true aims of the programme and to ensure its applicability to all information environments and not just more traditional “memory institutions” which currently form its core focus in practice, in particular bringing information and records management for business to the fore.
4. The nature of the thesis abstract be reviewed and more attention given to ensuring it provides a properly substantive summary of content, and that students are given suitable support to achieve this.
5. The provision of teaching materials (particularly bookstock, and particularly in Lithuanian) should be reviewed and expanded as deemed necessary. Moodle should be consolidated as the single VLE point of contact.
6. Staff should be encouraged and supported to engage in more publication of peer-reviewed research.

## **IV. SUMMARY**

The programme complies with the legal requirements for higher education study programmes in Lithuania. The programme aims appear a good fit with the stated needs of stakeholders but the learning outcomes are optimistic, difficult to measure and not properly covered by the curriculum, which remains more about “traditional“ information professions (“memory institutions“) with insufficient involvement from business.

The RT questions whether the range of content covered by the programme is truly sufficient to achieve the aims and learning outcomes, particularly in a broader European and

business/commercial environment. RT is concerned by the lack of reference to major external professional standards in information work (CILIP, ALA) and the absence of both records management and information technology topics other than where directly related to the operations of traditional libraries, archives and museums. This is a major weakness in the programme's present scope, which remains the child of the earlier LIS programme despite being presented as a "new" programme. RT saw little evidence of close engagement with important underlying technology such as XML (or even XHTML) or the semantic web, or significant investigation or evaluation of the role of social media and other non-traditional forms of information communication, which are all very much critical current topics in the field. The (translated) name of the programme in English - "Information Services" - is considered to be inappropriate for the programme in its current form. RT would suggest "Information Management" as more appropriate and more indicative of the programme's aspirations.

The overall level and balance of staff for what is currently being taught appears to be appropriate, with good range of interests and levels of expertise exhibited. Staff student ratios were reasonable and the great majority of students reported no difficulties in gaining access to staff for support. Staff were highly positive about the levels of support they received from the institution generally for their own development, but did not produce peer-reviewed research. RT would expect to see a more active engagement with academic research than was evidenced.

The range and availability of facilities and resources to the staff and students are good. Physical space, classrooms, computer rooms and student workspace appear appropriate, numerous and well-equipped. College library facilities are housed in a suitable and pleasant environment but physical resources for the course are somewhat limited, with a very small physical bookstock; students complained of a shortage of material in Lithuanian.

College promotes Moodle as the main Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) for the programme, and it seems broadly if not universally used. Although not essential, it might be more efficient for both staff and, particularly, students if Moodle were used more consistently across all courses. Videoconferencing for „guest lecturers“ is commonly used and RT would certainly encourage this; RT would also recommend that a further extension of this kind of technology could be used not only to improve the quality of teaching and learning, but also as an appropriate element of information technology for Information Science/Management students to learn about as tools to be used in the world of work. Arrangements for practice are undertaken with a high degree of interaction with stakeholders. Students are involved in the selection of their practices, and parallel practices are often arranged for the purpose of comparison. Overseas practice is also arranged, though not all students have the opportunity to experience this. Students mostly reported a high level of satisfaction with the way practice was handled.

Mechanisms are in place to encourage feedback both formal and informal from stakeholders, whose commitment and active participation of stakeholders is evident. Opportunity is provided for students to travel abroad (e.g. via Erasmus) and a good level of take-up is evidenced. Range of actual destinations is a little limited but nevertheless students mostly reported satisfaction with this aspect of their education. Students and staff described a quite clear understanding of assessment criteria but on some courses the summative mark was all that was provided by way of feedback. The RT would suggest that more formative feedback and real analysis of "assessing learning outcomes" (rather than just counting marks) takes place. The RT would in particular like to commend the use of requiring some pieces of work done prior to the final thesis to be vocally defended, as practice for the final thesis defence. This was reported by some staff, and is a method which could be more widely implemented to assist student preparation for the formal thesis defence.

English abstracts supplied with the student theses were often very short and appeared to be poor summaries of the actual content. The level of thesis work and consistency appeared to be appropriate and marks applied consistent. The credit value assigned to the Thesis is very low and does not appropriately reflect the workload or intellectual effort input.

Stakeholder employers reported a high level of satisfaction with the abilities of students, and they both value and support the programme. Unfortunately, RT saw no examples of graduates who were undertaking active information work in industry, commerce or other non-traditional workplaces. Current students reported that they mostly considered that “information“ was the focus of their work, not “libraries“, but the great majority of them had done practice in traditional library settings, and there was some uncertainty as to whether the range of skills they were learning would give them the broadest choice of work environment when they graduated.

Overall, the feeling of the RT is that this programme has much potential and simply needs more radical and honest development to achieve it. There is a great deal of positive support from traditional stakeholders and the sense of vision shown by employers, staff and students alike in starting to see information work as being broader (and more technical) than its more traditional library-oriented origins is laudable. However, this still needs to be extended to potential business stakeholders - the transition and breadth of vision still needs further nurturing and expansion if it is truly to be representative of current modern trends in information work.

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Information Services* (state code – 653P10001) at Šiauliai State College is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	3
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>17</b>

\*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. Johannes Bardoel
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Mr. Andrew David Dawson
	Prof. Dr. Triin Vihalemm
	Mr. Mindaugas Grajauskas
	Mrs. Meda Keleckaitė

**ŠIAULIŲ VALSTYBINĖS KOLEGIJOS PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ  
PROGRAMOS INFORMACIJOS PASLAUGOS (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 653P10001)  
2015-11-18 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-293 IŠRAŠAS**

&lt;...&gt;

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Šiaulių valstybinės kolegijos studijų programa *Informacijos paslaugos* (valstybinis kodas – 653P10001) vertinama teigiamai.

<b>Eil. Nr.</b>	<b>Vertinimo sritis</b>	<b>Srities įvertinimas, balais*</b>
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	<b>Iš viso:</b>	<b>17</b>

\* 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)

&lt;...&gt;

**IV. SANTRAUKA**

Programa atitinka aukštojo mokslo studijų programų Lietuvoje teisės aktų numatytus reikalavimus. Programos tikslai atitinka socialinių dalininkų išreikštus poreikius, tačiau studijų rezultatai yra optimistiški, juos sunku išmatuoti, jie nėra atspindėti studijų turinyje, kuris daugiau atspindi tradicines informacijos profesijas (atminties saugojimo institucijas), joje nepakankamai dalyvauja verslas.

Ekspertų grupei (toliau – EG) iškilo klausimas, ar programos turinio tikrai pakanka tikslams ir studijų rezultatams pasiekti, ypač platesniame Europos ir verslo (komerciniame) kontekste. EG susirūpinimą kelia pagrindinių darbui su informacija išorinių profesinių standartų trūkumas (ALA (JAV bibliotekų asociacija), CILIP (Didžiosios Britanijos Jungtinis bibliotekininkystės ir informacijos specialistų institutas)), taip pat trūksta įrašų valdymo ir informacinių technologijų temų, išskyrus tų, kurios tiesiogiai susijusios su tradicine bibliotekų, archyvų ir muziejų veikla. Tai yra dabartinės studijų programos apimties pagrindinis trūkumas, kuris išliko iš ankstesnės Bibliotekininkystės programos nepaisant to, kad pastaroji pristatoma kaip „nauja“ programa. EG pasigedo glaudaus darbo su svarbiomis pagrindinėmis technologijomis, pavyzdžiui, XML (ar net XHTML) arba semantiniu tinklu, arba socialinės žiniasklaidos ir kitų netradicinių informacinės komunikacijos formų, kurios yra labai svarbios šioje srityje, vaidmens esminės analizės ar vertinimo. Studijų programos pavadinimo vertimas į anglų kalbą - Information Services - nėra



tinkamas pagal dabartinę programos formą. EG siūlytų ją pavadinti Informacijos valdymas (angl. Information Management), kuris yra tikslesnis ir labiau atitinka programos siekius.

Bendras dabartinio dėstytojų personalo lygis ir balansas yra tinkamas, pasižymi geru interesų spektru ir rodomų kompetencijų lygiu. Personalo ir studentų santykis yra tinkamas; didžioji dauguma studentų nenurodė sunkumų personalo pagalbai gauti. Personalas labai palankiai atsiliepė apie paramą, kurią jiems teikia institucija apskritai jų kompetencijai gerinti, tačiau nėra atliekami tarpusavio recenzuojami moksliniai tyrimai. EG tikisi aktyvesnio dalyvavimo akademinuose tyrimuose, nei yra šiuo metu.

Personalui ir studentams skirtų patalpų ir išteklių pakanka, galimybės jais naudotis yra geros. Fizinės erdvės, auditorijos, kompiuterių klasės ir studentų darbui skirtos patalpos yra tinkamos, jų pakanka, jos yra gerai įrengtos. Kolegijos biblioteka įkurta tinkamoje ir malonioje aplinkoje, tačiau studijų programai skirtų fizinių išteklių yra šiek tiek ribota, labai mažai knygų egzempliorių; studentai skundėsi, kad trūksta medžiagos lietuvių kalba.

Kolegija skatina naudotis Moodle aplinka, kaip pagrindine studijų programos virtualaus mokymosi aplinka (VMA). Atrodo, kad ją plačiai, jei ne visuotinai, naudojama. Nors nėra būtina, tačiau būtų veiksmingiau, jei personalas ir, ypač studentai, sistemingiau naudotųsi Moodle sistema visuose kursuose. Kviestiniams svečiams plačiai naudojamos vaizdo konferencijos ir ekspertų grupė tikrai skatina tai. Ekspertų grupė taip pat rekomenduoja toliau skatinti šios technologijos naudojimą ne tik mokymo ir mokymosi kokybei gerinti, bet ir kaip tinkamą informacinių technologijų priemonę Informacijos mokslo ir (arba) valdymo studentams susipažinti su priemone, kuri būtų naudojama darbe. Dėl mokomosios praktikos vietų glaudžiai bendradarbiaujama su socialiniais dalininkais. Studentai dalyvauja renkantis vietą praktikai atlikti. Dažnai organizuojamos lygiagrečios praktikos palyginimo tikslais. Taip pat organizuojamos vietos praktikai atlikti užsienyje, tačiau ne visi studentai turi galimybę ją pasinaudoti. Dauguma studentų nurodė, kad yra labai patenkinti tuo, kaip organizuojama praktika.

Formalaus ir neformalaus grįžtamojo ryšio mechanizmai iš socialinių dalininkų, kurie yra įsipareigoję, yra. Aktyvus socialinių dalininkų dalyvavimas yra akivaizdus. Studentams suteikiama galimybė išvykti į užsienį (pavyzdžiui, pagal Erasmus programą) ir šia galimybe pasinaudoja nemažai studentų. Faktinių išvykimo kryptų skaičius yra šiek tiek ribotas, tačiau studentai dažniausiai yra patenkinti šiuo studijų aspektu. Studentai ir dėstytojai gana aiškiai supranta vertinimo kriterijus, tačiau dėl kai kurių dalykų kaupiamasis balas buvo viskas, ką galėjo nurodyti teikdami grįžtamąjį ryšį. EG rekomenduoja numatyti daugiau sudėtinį grįžtamąjį ryšį ir realią studijų rezultatų įvertinimo analizę (o ne tik balų skaičiavimą). EG ypač pageidautų, kad prieš baigiamąjį darbą būtų reikalaujama atlikti tam tikrus darbus, kurie būtų ginami žodžiu ir tokio būdu būtų pasipraktikuojama baigiamojo darbo gynimui. Tokią mintį išreiškė kai kurie dėstytojai. Tai metodas, kuris galėtų būti plačiai taikomas siekiant padėti studentams pasiręsti formaliam baigiamojo darbo gynimui.

Studentai kartu su baigiamuoju darbu taip pat teikia santraukas anglų kalba, kurios dažnai yra labai trumpos ir prastai apibendrina faktinį darbo turinį. Baigiamųjų darbų lygis ir logiškumas yra tinkami ir vertinimo balai yra nuoseklūs. Už baigiamąjį darbą skirta labai mažai kreditų, kas neatspindi darbo krūvio ar skirtų intelektualinių pastangų.

Darbdaviai nurodė, kad yra labai patenkinti studentų gebėjimais, ir remia bei vertina šią studijų programą. Deja, EG nematė absolventų, kurie aktyviai dirbtų informacijos darbą industrijos, komercijos ar kitose netradicinėse darbo vietose. Dabartiniai studentai nurodė, kad jie dažniausiai mano, kad informacija buvo jų darbo dėmesio centre, o ne bibliotekos, tačiau didžioji

dauguma iš jų atliko praktišką tradicinėse bibliotekose ir atsirado abejonės, ar jų įgytų gebėjimų spektras suteiks plataus darbo aplinkos pasirinkimą, kai jie baigs studijas.

Apskritai, EG mano, kad ši programa turi daug galimybių ir tiesiog reikia daugiau radikalių ir atvirų pastangų joms pasiekti. Tradiciniai socialiniai dalininkai teikia teigiamą paramą, darbdaviai, dėstytojai ir studentai mato darbą su informacija plačiau (ir daugiau techninį) nei orientuotą į tradicines bibliotekas. Tačiau tai dar reikia pristatyti potencialiems verslo atstovams – toliau puoselėti perėjimą prie tokios vizijos, jos aprėptį ir plėtrą, ar ji tikrai atstovautų dabartinėms šiuolaikinėms informacijos darbo tendencijoms.

<...>

### III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Ypač siūloma apsvarstyti ir keisti studijų programos pavadinimą į „Informacijos valdymas“, kad jis geriau atspindėtų tikrąjį ir numatomą turinį ir nebūtų painiojamas su daugiau techninėmis kompiuterių programomis Europos rinkoje.
2. Daugiau atsižvelgti į kitų šalių šioje srityje parengtus praktikos standartus (ypač JAV ir Jungtinėje Karalystėje) apibrėžiant programos atitinkamus tikslus, uždavinius ir studijų rezultatus, siekiant didinti konkurencingumą užsienio rinkose.
3. Kartu su 2 punktu peržiūrėti programos studijų rezultatus ir studijų turinį, siekiant užtikrinti, kad būtų įtrauktas kiek įmanoma platesnis ir tinkamesnis informacinių įgūdžių spektras, būtų geriau prisitaikyta prie tikrųjų programos tikslų ir užtikrintas jos tinkamumas visoms informacinėms aplinkoms, o ne tik tradicinėms atminties saugojimo institucijoms (angl. memory institutions), kurioms šiuo metu praktiškai skiriamas pagrindinis dėmesys, ypač į pirmą vietą išskelti verslo informacijos ir įrašų tvarkymą.
4. Peržiūrėti baigiamųjų darbų santraukos pobūdį ir daugiau dėmesio skirti, kad joje būtų pateikta tinkama esminė turinio santrauka ir studentams būtų suteikta tinkama parama šiam tikslui pasiekti.
5. Peržiūrėti aprūpinimą dėstytojų medžiaga (ypač knygų fondą ir fondą lietuvių kalba) ir, jei reikia, ją papildyti. Moodle sistema turi būti įtvirtinta kaip vienintelis virtualiosios mokymosi aplinkos (VMA) kontaktinis taškas.
6. Skatinti personalą ir jam padėti aktyviau dalyvauti tarpusavio recenzuojamų mokslinių tyrimų skelbime.

<...>

---

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)