



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *BALTŲ IR GERMANŲ KULTŪROS
PAVELDO VIZUALIZACIJA (valstybinis kodas – 621V72003)***
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
**OF *CULTURAL VISUALISATION OF BALTIC AND GERMANIC
HERITAGE (state code – 621V72003)***
STUDY PROGRAMME
At KLAIPĖDA UNIVERSITY

1. Prof. József Laszlovszky, *academic,*
2. Prof. Christopher Whitehead, *academic,*
3. Dr. Raquel Piqué Huerta, *academic,*
4. Dr. Povilas Blaževičius, *academic, social partners' representative,*
5. Mr Almantas Abromaitis, *students' representative.*

Evaluation Coordinator Ms Eglė Grigonytė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2015

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Baltų ir germanų kultūros paveldo vizualizacija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621V72003
Studijų sritis	Humanitariniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Paveldo studijos
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (1,5 metai)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	90 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Paveldosaugos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	Lietuvos Respublikos švietimo ir mokslo ministro 2012 m. gruodžio 19 d. įsakymu Nr. SR-6227

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage</i>
State code	621V72003
Study area	Humanities
Study field	Heritage studies
Type of the study programme	University Studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1,5 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	90 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Heritage
Date of registration of the study programme	19 th December 2012, under the order of the Minister of the Ministry for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania No SR-6227

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of evaluation process.....	4
1.2. General.....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/Additional information.....	5
1.4. The Review Panel.....	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	7
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	7
2.2. Curriculum design	8
2.3. Teaching staff	11
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	12
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	14
2.6. Programme management	16
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	18
IV. SUMMARY.....	19
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	20

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of evaluation process

The evaluation of on-going study programmes is based on the **Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes**, approved by the Order No 1-01-162 of 20th December 2010 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereafter, SKVC). Evaluation is intended to help higher education institutions to constantly improve their study programmes and to inform the public about quality of studies.

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: 1) *self-evaluation and the Self-evaluation Report prepared by a Higher Education Institution (hereafter, the HEI)*; 2) *a visit of the Review Panel at the higher education institution*; 3) *preparation of the evaluation report by the Review Panel and its publication*; 4) *follow-up activities*.

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

The programme is **accredited for 6 years** if all evaluation areas were 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 SKVC. Along with the Self-evaluation Report and Annexes, the following additional documents have been provided by the HEI after the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	CV of Prof. Gintautas Vyšniauskas.

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

The study programme *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* at Klaipėda University is a one and half-year (full-time studies) second cycle programme.

The programme was accredited on 3rd of January 2013 (Order No SV6-1 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education).

For the evaluation, the following documents were used:

1. Law on Higher Education and Research of Republic of Lithuania;
2. Procedure of the External Evaluation and Accreditation of Study Programmes;
3. General Requirements of Master Degree Study Programmes;
4. Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes.

The basis for the evaluation of the study programme is the Self-Evaluation Report (hereafter, the SER) prepared in 2015, its annexes and the site visit of the Review Panel to Klaipėda University.

The visit included meetings with different groups: the administrative staff of the Faculty; staff responsible for preparing the SER; teaching staff; students currently on the programme; and social partners, employers and alumni associated with the programme. The Review Panel evaluated various support services (classrooms, library, computer facilities), examined a sample of students' final work including final theses, and various other materials. After the Review Panel discussions and the additional preparation of conclusions and remarks, preliminary general conclusions of the visit were presented to the community of the University. After the visit, the Review Panel met to discuss and agree the content of their final report, which represents the agreed views of the Panel.

1.4. The Review Panel

The Review Panel was composed according to the *Description of the Review Team Member Recruitment*, approved by the Order No 1-01-151, 11/11/2011 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The visit to the HEI was conducted by the Panel on 19th May, 2015.

1. Prof. József Laszlovszky (the Chair of the Team)

Professor at Central European University (CEU), Head of the Programme Committee (CEU): Cultural Heritage Studies: Academic Research, Policy, Management, Hungary;

2. Prof. Christopher Whitehead

Professor of Museology, Newcastle University, United Kingdom;

3. Dr. Raquel Piqué Huerta

Lecturer at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Catalonia;

4. Dr. Povilas Blaževičius

Archeology Group Coordinator at National Museum Palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, Lecturer at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, Lithuania;

5. Mr Almantas Abromaitis

Graduate of the first cycle study programme in History at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, graduate of the second cycle study programme in European Studies at Vilnius University, Lithuania.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The Review Panel can state that the *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* programme aims are publicly accessible. Intended learning outcomes are publicly accessible as well¹. After in-depth review of the curriculum and comparing the main aims and intended learning outcomes of the programme the Panel have to point that the **name of the programme does not fully corresponds with the content**. Study subjects and topics included in the programme cover a wide range of heritage research and actualization, as well as a range of heritage protection methods. Meanwhile, the term “visualisation” in modern heritage protection is used in a much narrower context – to restore, develop or interpret the visibility of the corresponding object in space. In this case, being a part of the programme title this term orients to the different aims of the programme. In the opinion of the Review Panel, an inaccurate use of the term does not match the context of this programme. The Panel propose that instead of using the term “Visualisation”, the programme developers should change it to the wider meaning terms as “Interpretation” or “Communication”.

The Panel can acknowledge that the SER explains the frequency of reviewing of the intended learning outcomes clearly – self-evaluation is performed every three years. Students and social partners participate in self-evaluations (the SER, p. 32).

The analysis of the SER and the site visit shows that the programme aims and intended learning outcomes are accurately based on the academic and professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market. Accordingly, *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* programme graduates should be able to conduct scientific research work independently, develop competences and skills to effectively administrate the resources of tangible and intangible heritage, innovatively use the knowledge gained in the infrastructure of cultural tourism and communicate it to the public of Lithuania, foreign tourists and experts in order to develop understandings of, and communicate, Baltic-Germanic cultural heritage.

Graduates should develop during the learning period a strong ability for independent and team work, alongside motivation for continuing professional development.

¹ https://web.liemsis.lt/kuis/stp_report_ects.card_ml?p_valkod=621V72003&p_year=2013&p_lang=LT;
http://www.aikos.smm.lt/en/StudyProgramm/_layouts/15/Asw.Aikos.RegisterSearch/ObjectFormResult.aspx?o=PROG&f=ProgEn&key=2265&pt=of&ctx_sr=5Ap4z%2bWIEVrI04xeoygUSHetiaQ%3d

The main aim of the *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* study programme is to prepare qualified specialists in culture heritage visualisation. Master graduates are required to have a high level of theoretical knowledge based on interdisciplinary applied research on the concept of Baltic-Germanic heritage in social and geocultural contexts. Alongside this, graduates are required to have the ability to use the knowledge gained in scientific research, to see the interaction between heritage and other scientific fields, the ability to interpret, analyse, provide arguments and assess cultural heritage as the expression of national identity in global situations.

Graduates are also required to be capable to work in the areas of administration, research or communication of heritage sphere information. Such knowledge and theoretical skills are imperative to hold a position in various state institutions and private companies dealing with cultural heritage: municipalities, museums, national or regional parks, tourism development, urban design or even business development companies. Graduates are also prepared for continuing their studies at doctoral level (the SER, p. 8).

The Panel can confirm that the SER provides sufficient information on national and international legal acts, demonstrating that the programme aims and intended learning outcomes are consistent with the type – university studies and the level of studies – 2nd cycle and the level of offered qualification – Master of Heritage.

The offered study subjects together with the experienced teaching staff create the basis for developing the knowledge, educational background and skills required for the Masters level specialists to work in the Cultural Heritage field. However, as mentioned above, **the name of the programme should be specified to be fully compatible with the programme intended learning outcomes, content and the qualification offered.**

2.2. Curriculum design

The Panel can confirm that the curriculum of the Master programme essentially meets legal requirements². The Master programme in *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* is competently managed and, according to the admission data and competition score, a suitably demanding programme for the students.

The duration of the studies is 1,5 years (3 semesters) and the volume is 90 ECTS (1400 hours). As it is required in the legal acts, the number of study subjects per semester is not more than 5

² General Requirements of Master Degree Study Programmes, approved by the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania.

and each study subject covers 6 ECTS. The full-time studies encompass 600 hours, first and second semesters covering 300 hours each. During the first and second semesters students have 8 compulsory and 2 optional study subjects (48 + 12 = 60 ECTS). The third semester is dedicated to the preparation and the defense of a final thesis. This semester covers 800 hours (30 ECTS). On average, student's independent work amounts to 75% of the volume of each course (the SER, p. 12, 13).

Study subjects are spread evenly and their themes are not repetitive. The content of the subjects is consistent with the type and level of the studies. Available subjects comprise on the one hand essential topics of cultural heritage visualisation (or interpretation); on the other hand it gives students the opportunity to select relevant subjects presenting different aspects of cultural heritage – church history, sacral landscape, maritime cultural heritage, cultural landscape genesis, regions and regional policy and Prussian language.

Although one of the aims of study programme is “to prepare specialists of high qualification in visualisation of cultural heritage who will be able to appreciate and assess material and non-material cultural heritage” (the SER, p. 8), the Panel noticed that it looks like some important themes or aspects are left out from the curriculum. First of all, this applies to the **lack of a broader overview of the region's material cultural heritage, e.g. archaeological cultures and burial monuments as a considerable part of the cultural landscape**. Such themes could be added to the already existing study subjects, like *Landscape Values Protection and Regulation*, *Sacral Landscape* or *Maritime Cultural Heritage*. Second, there is a **lack of the study of evolution of the regional architecture** which could easily be provided by experienced lecturers, like Professor Petras Grecevičius or others in study subjects *Protection and Regulation of Landscape Values* or *Maritime Cultural Heritage*. The Panel also suggest that **museology, as an important tool of cultural heritage presentation, would also enrich the programme** (for example in the study subject *Geography of Cultural Heritage and Medias* or as a separate elective subject). The site visit revealed that all associated parts of this programme (students, teachers, administration and social partners) agree on the language issue: **an elective German language subject would be a valuable part of the education** of the Masters programme graduate. Lastly, the Review Panel noted that there was no evident content relating to general theoretical debates about the meanings and politics of heritage, and nor was there evidence of engagement with the very considerable literature in this area (e.g. uses of the past, heritage values, legislation and conventions, difficult heritage, heritage and identity, memory studies etc.) and that providing a grounding in this as part of the programme would confer an advantage upon students.

The Panel can confirm that in general the content and methods of the subjects are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes: there are several and different students' achievements monitoring activities (written and oral exams, seminars, project elaboration, etc.). The scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. However, after the SER analysis and the site visit, the Panel noted that **the ratio of theoretical and practical subjects is not fully adequate**. Moreover, both, teachers and students agreed that professional practice could be very useful for the future specialists in cultural visualisation of Baltic and Germanic heritage. The Panel suggest that it would be very important for the future specialists not only to have theoretical subjects with practical activities, but also to have an opportunity to undertake professional practice in relevant institutions directly connected with cultural heritage. The practice could combine theories, enable testing the knowledge practically and may in some cases create good grounds for Master thesis as well. That is why the Panel would like to encourage the Faculty administration to look for opportunities to integrate professional practice in the curriculum. The site visit showed that a number of the social partners are very interested in having trainees.

It is worth noticing that during the analysis of study subject descriptions some inaccuracies were observed: *Sacral Landscape* (H340M021) – no summary and no intended learning outcomes are provided, some of the main literature of the theme are not available in the University libraries; *Maritime Cultural Heritage* (P000M056) – some of the main literature of the theme are not available in the University libraries; *Cultural Landscape Genesis* (M000M205) – no intended learning outcomes, the references and additional literature must be updated and renewed; *Landscape Values Protection and Regulation* (H000M104) – a mistake in translation theme 4? (Types of Archeological **Artifacts**/Archeologinių **vertybių** tipai); *Philosophical Heritage on the Convergence of Baltic and Germanic Cultures* (H000M096) – mistakes translating terms (“Baltic and Germanic cultures” = “Baltic-Germanic culture” or “Baltic and Germanic culture”).

After evaluation of the teaching subjects, the Panel can state that the scope of the programme is wide and varied. However, as stated above, it was noted that **the study subjects unevenly cover the scientific achievement and the latest trends in Cultural and Critical Heritage Studies, and notwithstanding the regional focus of the programme, the lack of attention to other geographical contexts is notable**. These remarks are closely related to the observed shortage of some essential literature. With a reference to this, the Panel suggest that the bibliography and library holdings should be renewed to include more international and local publications.

Regarding the final theses, the Panel can state that topics are fully coherent with the content of the programme and cover a wide variety of themes (topics are provided on the Annex 3.4, the SER).

2.3. Teaching staff

The Review Panel can confirm that the study programme is provided by the staff (the SER, p. 20) who meets legal requirements. According to lecturers CVs (the Annex 3.3, the SER), the teaching team is highly qualified, productive and comprises acknowledged scientists in their field of research, both in Lithuania and abroad. All fifteen lecturers meet at least minimum qualification requirements. Moreover, the majority of them exceed them. 14 (93%) of them holds a PhD degree and one without a scientific degree is an experienced professional from the media sphere and develops students' skills in practical communication.

The age range of the teaching staff (32-41 years 35,8%; 55-63 years 42,8%; 67-70 years 21,4%) (the Annex 3.2, the SER) reflects the coherence and sustainability of the team. This not only ensures the constant involvement of promising young scientists in the team, but also the necessary extension of educational experience and the continuation of the experience transfer from the older generation to younger.

According to data provided in the SER, the teaching staff also meets all legal requirements in terms of their qualification – 5 (33,3%) of teaching staff are professors, 6 (40%) associate professors, and 4 (26,7%) lecturers. Teachers are clearly experienced regarding pedagogical and scientific knowledge. Besides that, teaching team is formed by active and productive scientists. The staff of the programme are active scientists who publish their research results in reviewed scientific journals both on national and international level. The research publications of the programme staff are related to the areas of cultural philosophy, tangible and intangible cultural heritage, research dissemination and visualisation. However, according to the SER (the Annex 3.3), only a part of the staff of the programme participate in different mobility programmes to develop their expertise in universities abroad. In the last 5 years only 1 staff member appears to have visited foreign universities – 5 times to give lectures (Annex 3.3, the SER). During the existence of the programme (2013–2015), **no visiting lecturers from foreign higher education institutions appear to have lectured** to *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* programme students. The Review Panel suggest that the University administration should encourage teaching staff to travel abroad to lecture and develop professional competencies and

expertise. Despite the previous comments, the Panel can confirm that the **qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.**

The Panel consider that administration of the programme should look for possibilities to invite foreign academics to enrich the curriculum and broaden students' horizons.

According to the SER information (the SER p. 21, 22) and the onsite visit, it is clear to the Panel that staff participation in conferences, training trips to research centres abroad, participation in different projects in Lithuania demonstrates a sufficient level of activity. It can be stated that the majority of the teaching staff members' scientific research and practice activities are closely related with the subjects they teach. This allows their knowledge to be constantly updated and means that the material of subjects presented to the students during the lectures has to some extent contemporary currency. However, the Review Panel have to note that the teachers are mostly involved not in global or international, but rather in regional or local projects/events. The Panel believes that this is closely connected with the one of the previously mentioned shortages – uneven presentation of the latest trends in Cultural and Critical Heritage Studies. **The Panel recommend that Klaipėda University should support and encourage as much as possible teaching staff participation not only in the international conferences but also in research and dissemination projects directly connected to the interpretation of the global cultural heritage.**

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

In the year 2002 Faculty of Humanities of Klaipėda University was moved in the renovated building at Herkaus Manto Street 84 (Klaipėda). The Faculty of Humanities is situated in the buildings of Neo-Gothic-style army complex built in 1907. It should be possible for the students of *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* studies actually to use the University buildings as a good example object for heritage investigations.

Students of the Department of Culture Studies (together with Philosophy students) use 16 classrooms with 307 working places. The classrooms have the necessary furniture and white/smart boards, they have good lighting and Wi-Fi. All classrooms have been modernized and provided with new stationary or mobile equipment (the SER p. 23). The Faculty of Humanities also has 2 computer labs with 50 computers, two language labs with 25 seats each; 4 mobile sets of multimedia are being used for the studies. The Panel can state that the premises of the Faculty clearly respond to the need of space for contact classes.

Students can use Klaipėda University Library with 294 reader seats, including 47 computerized ones. Since 2001, students and staff have been using an e-catalogue (<http://aleph.library.lt/>) and ordering publications via Internet. Klaipėda University Library funds include 466,720 copies (159,143 titles) of documents. The library funds get additional 17,000 copies per year.

The library of the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Health Sciences (both in the same premises) boasts an area of 170 m² and has a Lending Department and a reading room with 12 reader seats including 2 computerised ones. The resources of the library consist of 33,719 copies of documents, including 27,000 publications in the field of humanities. The principal literature for the studies of programme of *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* is accumulated in the Faculty of Humanities library, Martynas Mažvydas Reading Room, and the Division of Rare Publications, Collections, and Manuscripts, while fiction is stored in the libraries of the Faculty of Pedagogy (17,875 copies) and Arts (14, 687 copies), and the serials, in the Reading Room of Periodicals (the SER, p. 24). Rich collection of books, numerous periodical subscriptions and broad availability of electronic recourses makes the library an important element for students to ensure good opportunities to access the required scientific sources.

The Panel can confirm that the teaching and learning equipment are more or less adequate both in size and quality. The Panel can state that teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible. It is clear that the premises of the libraries are big enough and properly equipped. However, according to the SER (the SER, p. 36) and as a result of the Review Panel meeting with the teaching staff, it appears that there is a lack of funds for purchasing literature in the Faculty; too few scientific periodicals and books in English are being subscribed to; more specific literature dedicated to the cultural heritage is needed. The Panel believe, that in the future, Faculty or University authorities **should pay more attention to library acquisitions and ensure that the most important and essential literature is available.**

Klaipėda University Library works till 7.00 PM on weekdays and till 5.00 PM on weekends (<http://www.ku.lt/biblioteka/darbo-laikas/>). However, it should be noted that the Faculty of Humanities library – where the principal literature for the studies of programme of *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* is held – is open only until 5.00 PM on weekdays and on weekends it is closed. The Panel can state that the Faculty **authorities have partly solved this shortcoming already, by prolonging working hours of the library during the exams session.**

As already mentioned above, there is no plan to include professional practice for the *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* programme students, but the Panel believe that the teaching staff should consider this. The Faculty has fewer facilities than they need to conduct such practice in their own premises. That is why the Panel suggest creating even stronger contacts with social partners and employers, and trying to organize opportunities to conduct professional practice at the different institutions connected with cultural heritage. Undoubtedly, this would significantly extend students' knowledge and skills. Besides that, stronger relations with private sector could be beneficial in many ways: financial and institutional support of the programme, possible workplaces for the graduates, professionals' consultations, lectures of practitioner etc.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The Review Panel can confirm that the admission requirements are well-founded, clearly formulated and publicly available. The requirements of the competitive score are formed according to the approved formula. It is determined that the persons admitted to second-cycle university studies must have graduated in the Bachelor's studies and have the Bachelor's degree in a similar field of study or a degree of Professional Bachelor and having completed additional studies relevant to the Master programme (the SER, p. 26). Besides the average score of the diploma supplement, the score of the final work (or average score of the exams) and assessment of the test, additional scores for scientific publications are added to the competitive score.

According to the SER and the meeting with students during onsite visit, the majority of the programme students have jobs. This is possible logistically, because the lectures take place from two to three days a week. Lectures mainly take place in the afternoon, and the work with academic advisors is arranged by an individual schedule (the SER, p. 26–27).

The Review Panel can confirm that the procedure of exams and credit tests (set by Klaipėda University Department of Studies) is clear and appropriate. The monitoring of the programme's student progress is carried out by different means and is sufficiently comprehensive (the SER, p. 28). It is clear that such a diversity of actions to co-ordinate the students' academic record is possible due to a small number of students (currently there are 8 students on the programme) and is very effective in the dropout reduction. Regarding dropout rates, the Panel can state that in 2013–2015 year course there were no dropouts.

The data presented in the SER and collected during the onsite visit indicates that there is a stable competition among applicants from the programme of *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and*

Germanic Heritage. The average for the basic competition is 2.7–1.6 persons for one place (the SER p. 27). The stable competition and high ratio of graduated students (currently at 100%) makes the *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* study programme not only attractive, but also highly productive.

To strengthen theoretical knowledge, students have to conduct their practical tasks during the study subjects (the SER p. 26), but not at cultural heritage institutions, as was mentioned above. According to the SER, students are encouraged to participate in research, artistic and applied research activities during *Landscape Values Protection and Regulation, Research Work (Cultural Heritage and Project of Heritage Visualisation)* and other study subjects, but the Panel noted that students' research activities are mainly realized through their course papers and final theses integrated in the study programme (the SER, p. 27; the Annex 3.1).

Evaluating local student's opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes the Panel noted that due to the intensive study schedule and the duration of studies (only 1.5 years) there is a lack of possibilities to take advantage of exchange programmes. During the last 3 years period only one *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* programme student studied abroad (the SER, p. 29). During the onsite visit teachers and programme managers confirmed that there are some private and informal contacts with Berlin Humboldt University, Köln, Frankfurt and Hamburg Universities. The Panel suggest that Faculty authorities should develop and expand upon such contacts and sign official cooperation agreements with above mentioned and other foreign universities where a similar study programmes are taught. It should be perceived as a clear shortage of this study programme that there were **no incoming students in the programme**.

According to data collected during the onsite visit, it is clear that the **students must be more strongly supported to participate in or to conduct different scientific projects or researches**. Participation in different projects connected to the research, interpretation and communication of cultural heritage could impart valuable experience and practical skills. Different practical skills could help students writing Master thesis and/or competing for on the job market in the future.

The Panel can confirm that the higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support. Information related to studies is easily accessible on Klaipėda University and Faculty of Humanities Internet pages, and is permanently displayed on the Faculty of Humanities note boards. Social support of the students in the Faculty of Humanities is also appropriate (the SER, p. 30). Diversity of tolls to support students, according to the study

results and/or needs, varies from opportunities to use dormitories, health and sport centres, psychological consultations, social grants, state student loans and etc.

On the basis of the SER and onsite visit the Panel can confirm that the assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available. The assessment system is easily available via Klaipėda University website. The general principles of assessment requirements are applied for the whole Faculty of Humanities, and special requirements of separate study subjects are introduced to the students during the first lecture. The Panel can state, that the assessment requirements for practical elements are also clear; likewise the requirements for the Master thesis assessment are clear and comprehensible.

Bearing in mind that Klaipėda University Career Centre is just beginning the Alumni Career Monitoring Programme, according to the SER and the results of the onsite visit, it appears that about 50% of programme alumni were or are working in areas which requires abilities acquired on the programme. On the other hand, the study programme *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* (years of study 2013 – 2014) was mainly chosen by already employed individuals (the SER, p. 32). However, there is still a lack of information about the feedback of the employers. **The Panel suggests that the study programme authorities should carry out a continuous survey of graduates and employers.**

2.6. Programme management

The Review Panel can confirm that the management and monitoring of *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* programme meets appropriated requirements. It is clear from the SER that responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly distributed.

Under the direction of Studies Quality Committee and the Department of Quality Management, information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed. Self-evaluation of the study programme is performed every three years. Students and social partners participate in self-evaluation teams. The quality of study subjects (components) is analysed separately: study subjects are certified for 3 years. Curriculum development is ongoing within the same time frame (the SER, p. 33).

According to the SER and onsite visit, great attention is paid to graduate employability resulting in systematic and ongoing cooperation with the social partners. The issues of science and study quality are discussed in Faculty Councils and Senate and Study Quality Committee. Departments

play a crucial role in the development, elaboration and in pursuit of concrete study programmes, and in ensuring the overall quality of studies in the Faculty of Humanities (the SER, p. 33).

According to the SER (the Annex 3.2–3.3) and during the onsite visit, the Review Panel noted that the teaching staff comprises experienced specialists who come from very different departments of Klaipėda University. There is no doubt that individually the lecturers are competent scientists and pedagogues, but the Panel noted a lack of mutual cooperation. **The Panel suggest that team-building events should be organized to improve cooperation between personnel.** Common projects, research and practical activity will increase the sustainability of the collective and will affect the quality of teaching.

The Panel noticed that information about interviewing teachers, students and social partners in relation to this programme during the last self-evaluation is very abstract. Likewise, greater clarity in reporting precise remarks and the responses to them (the steps taken by the administration) could be provided.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Clarify the name of the programme so that it is fully compatible with its intended learning outcomes, content and the qualification offered.
2. Add a structured professional practice element and augment the role of practical training in the curriculum.
3. Integrate more detailed attention to scientific achievements and the latest trends of global, international, and European cultural heritage studies in the content of the programme, including critical and theoretical perspectives.
4. Increase the availability of relevant cultural heritage textbooks in the English language in the library.
5. Support and encourage as much as possible participation of the teaching staff in the research and dissemination of global cultural heritage.
6. Create stronger contacts with social partners and employers and try to organise opportunities to conduct professional practice at the different institutions connected with cultural heritage.
7. Expand and develop the contacts and build official cooperation agreements with other foreign universities where similar study programmes are taught.
8. Promote students' involvement in different scientific research projects.
9. Carry out a continuous survey of graduates and employers.
10. Organize team-building events to encourage better cooperation between personnel.

IV. SUMMARY

The Master study programme *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* in Klaipėda University is a new programme which exists since 2013. The study subjects offered in the programme together with the experienced teaching staff create the basis for developing the knowledge, educational background and skills required for the Masters-level specialists to work in the Cultural Heritage field. The programme is competently managed and, according to the admission data and competition score, is a suitably demanding for the students.

The Review Panel can confirm that the teaching and learning equipment are more or less adequate both in size and quality, the teaching materials are also adequate and accessible. In the view of the Review Panel, Faculty or University authorities should pay more attention to library acquisitions and ensure that the most important and essential literature would be available.

The Panel have to notice, that the name of the programme should be specified to be fully compatible with the programme intended learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered. After evaluation of the teaching subjects, it can be stated that the scope of the programme is wide and varied. However, it was noted that the study subjects unevenly cover the scientific achievements and the latest trends in Cultural and Critical Heritage Studies, and notwithstanding the regional focus of the programme, the lack of attention to other geographical contexts is notable. The Panel suggest that it would be very important for the future specialists not only to have theoretical subjects with practical activities, but also to have an opportunity to undertake professional practice in relevant institutions directly connected with cultural heritage.

The Panel recommend Klaipėda University to support and encourage as much as possible teaching staff participation in research and dissemination of global cultural heritage, also participation in mobility programmes. On the other hand, the Faculty authorities should develop and expand contacts and sign official cooperation agreements with foreign universities where similar study programmes are developed.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Cultural Visualisation of Baltic and Germanic Heritage* (state code – 621V72003) at Klaipėda University is given a 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	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	16

*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. József Laszlovszky
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Christopher Whitehead
	Dr. Raquel Piqué Huerta
	Dr. Povilas Blaževičius
	Mr. Almantas Abromaitis

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
BALŲ IR GERMANŲ KULTŪROS PAVELDO VIZUALIZACIJA (VALSTYBINIS
KODAS – 621V72003) 2015-09-11 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-248
IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Baltų ir germanų kultūros paveldo vizualizacija* (valstybinis kodas – 621V72003) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	16

* 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)

<...>

V. SANTRAUKA

Magistrantūros studijų programa *Baltų ir germanų kultūros paveldo vizualizacija* yra nauja, nuo 2013 m. Klaipėdos universitete vykdoma programa. Programos studijų dalykai ir patyręs akademinis personalas yra pagrindas, užtikrinantis žinias, išsilavinimą ir įgūdžius, reikalingus magistro lygio specialistui, kad jis galėtų dirbti kultūros paveldo srityje. Programos vadyba gera; atsižvelgiant į studentų priėmimo duomenis ir konkursinį balą, šioje studijų programoje studentams keliami reikalavimai yra nustatyti tinkamai.

Ekspertų grupė gali patvirtinti, kad studijoms naudojama įranga yra tinkama ir jos pakanka, metodinės medžiagos taip pat pakanka ir ji yra prieinama studentams. Ekspertų manymu,

fakulteto ar universiteto vadovybė turėtų daugiau dėmesio skirti bibliotekos ištekliams ir užtikrinti, kad svarbiausios ir būtinos mokslinės literatūros būtų užtektinai.

Ekspertų grupė norėtų atkreipti dėmesį į studijų programos pavadinimą, kuris turėtų visiškai derėti su numatomais studijų rezultatais, programos turiniu ir suteikiama kvalifikacija. Įvertinus studijų dalykus, galima teigti, kad programa yra plačios apimties ir įvairi. Vis dėlto ne visi studijų dalykai yra vienodai orientuoti į krypties mokslo pasiekimus bei naujausias kultūros bei kritines paveldo studijų tendencijas. Nepaisant regioniško elemento šioje studijų programoje, pastebima dėmesio kitiems geografiniams kontekstams stoka. Ekspertų grupė siūlytų ne tik dėstyti teorinius studijų dalykus derinant juos su praktiniais užsiėmimais, bet ir suteikti galimybę būsimiems specialistams atlikti profesinę praktiką institucijose, tiesiogiai susijusiose su kultūros paveldu.

Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja Klaipėdos universitetui kuo labiau skatinti ir remti dėstytojų dalyvavimą mokslo tiriamojoje veikloje, taip pat skleidžiant pasaulio kultūros paveldą bei jų dalyvavimą judumo programose. Antra vertus, fakulteto vadovybė turėtų plėtoti ryšius ir pasirašyti oficialias bendradarbiavimo sutartis su kitais užsienio universitetais, kuriuose vykdomos panašios studijų programos.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Patikslinti studijų programos pavadinimą, kad jis visiškai derėtų su numatomais studijų rezultatais, programos turiniu ir suteikiama kvalifikacija.
2. Papildyti studijų programą profesine praktika bei studijų dalykuose daugiau dėmesio skirti praktiniam rengimui.
3. Įtraukti į studijų programą daugiau krypties mokslo pasiekimų, taip pat daugiau dėmesio skirti naujausioms pasaulio, tarptautinėms bei Europos kultūros paveldo studijų tendencijoms, įskaitant kritines ir teorines perspektyvas.
4. Didinti kultūros paveldui skirtų vadovėlių anglų kalba skaičių bibliotekoje.
5. Kuo labiau skatinti ir remti dėstytojų dalyvavimą moksliniuose tyrimuose ir žinių apie pasaulio kultūros paveldą sklaidoje.
6. Stiprinti ryšius su socialiniais partneriais ir darbdaviais bei stengtis užtikrinti studentams galimybę atlikti profesinę praktiką įvairiose su kultūros paveldu susijusiose institucijose.
7. Plėtoti ryšius ir sudaryti oficialias bendradarbiavimo sutartis su kitais užsienio universitetais, kuriuose vykdomos panašios studijų programos.

8. Skatinti studentų dalyvavimą įvairiuose mokslinių tyrimų projektuose.
9. Atlikti testines absolventų ir darbdavių apklausas.
10. Organizuoti darbuotojus suburiančius renginius, siekiant paskatinti juos labiau bendradarbiauti tarpusavyje.

<...>

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