



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto

EUROPOS SAJUNGOS VIEŠOJI POLITIKA IR ADMINISTRAVIMAS
(621N70003)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF EUROPEAN UNION PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
(621N70003)

at Vytautas Magnus University

Experts' team:

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

Evaluation coordinator – Ms Kornelija Bukantaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2016

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Europos Sąjungos viešoji politika ir administravimas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621N70003
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Viešasis administravimas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Viešojo administravimo magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	Atnaujinimo data: 2014-08-01

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>European Union Public Policy and Administration</i>
State code	621N70003
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Public administration
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Public administration
Date of registration of the study programme	Update date: 2014-08-01

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process	4
1.2. General	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information	5
1.4. The Review Team	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	5
2.2. Curriculum design	7
2.3. Teaching staff	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	9
2.5. Study process and student's performance assessment	10
2.6. Programme management	13
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	16
IV. SUMMARY	17
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	19

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2. General

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

No.	Name of the document
1	List of the meeting with senior administration etc.
2	Public Policy and Administration of the European Union. Programme of Master Studies
3	Teaching timetables for 2015/2016 study year

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

Vytautas Magnus University, VMU in Kaunas was established in 1922 and re-established in 1989. There are 13 academic divisions at VMU and 10 faculties where the Faculty of Political Science and Diplomacy is responsible of the study programme European Union Public Policy and Administration. VMU is managed by two collegial bodies, the Council and the Senate and headed by the Rector. International collaboration is broad and agreements are made with 120 universities in 40 countries. To this 250 LLP/Erasmus partners in 30 European countries can be added (SER, p.4).

The faculty consists of 5 departments and 3 centres and carries 6 Bachelor and 10 Master study programmes. Approximately 1500 students take these programmes or different courses at the Faculty. About 70 lecturers are employed by the Faculty.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of expert's 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 23/11/16.

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

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The Programme European Union Public Policy and Administration, 120 ECTS Credits has been designed according to the legal requirements. The goal of the programme “is to prepare highly qualified specialists of public administration and analysts who will possess the

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

skills and special expertise and experience in the matters of the European Union” (SER p. 6). After completing the programme a master’s degree in Public Administration will be granted. Programme objectives and learning outcomes as described in the self-evaluation report, SER are focusing on European Union Law, Lithuanian European Public Policies and abilities students should achieve of preparing, implementing and evaluating projects administering EU support, evaluate main challenges of European public policies and to perform practical work in different sectors in this field. Further on students, after completing the programme, also should have the ability to conduct scientific analysis in this field and be familiar with the high culture of professional thinking (SER p.6).

The programme aims and learning outcomes are described at p.6 SER, mainly as abilities and familiarity and it can make it difficult for students to understand what kind of knowledge, theories etc. they need to gain to reach this. All together described in seven points. When asked for further information about the learning outcomes, the accreditation team received a description (appendix 2), which does not correlate with what is written in the self-evaluation report. In this description study results (learning outcomes) is described in six points and talks about “knowledge and understanding of the specific features of the political – administrative system of the EU, content of main EU common public policies, skills to put into work EU legal acts...coordinate institutional interaction, consult political decision makers...” (appendix 2). All six points are related to practice professional knowledge, skills and abilities in public administration. Programme objectives and learning outcomes are not well defined or clear and has to be clarified. To make this clear learning outcomes can be described in different points either as knowledge, abilities or values, this might also make it easier to assess if students have reached the learning outcomes. In site meeting students had difficulties to understand questions about learning outcomes, maybe because of language barriers but it is important they gain information on what is expected from them to gain knowledge on. Programme objectives and learning outcomes are not publicly accessible, what is found on the internet is not the same version.

The programme aims and learning outcomes are, according to what is presented in the self-evaluation report only partly based on the academic and/or professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market. The programme aims and learning outcomes can be developed by adding knowledge of theories and concepts related to this field student should gain as well as deepen their knowledge in different scientific research methods and critical thinking and analysis to be consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications needed. The name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the

qualifications offered are partly compatible with each other. Our recommendation is to developed programme objectives and learning outcomes to make this clear.

2.2. Curriculum design

The study programme European Public Policy and Administration meets the legal requirements for MA studies (SER, Table 1, p. 5). Regarding learning outcomes, it is expressly stated that “the expected learning outcomes of the whole programme determine the subjects to be studied, their sequence and links between subjects” (SER, p. 7). However, the SER does not contain learning outcomes but only specifies the “abilities” students should possess after successful graduation (SER, p. 6). Only on demand the programme management supplied a list with six so-called “Study results (learning outcomes)”. In contrast to this, at the level of the single course descriptors there are categories like “Study program results” (general learning outcomes?), “Course results” and “Evaluation criteria”, which seem at least at the level of the single courses to be related to each other. However, they are apparently or at least not visibly enough linked to the six so-called “Study results (learning outcomes)” provided for by the programme management. This is a major shortcoming, because general learning outcomes seem not to be known by all teachers – even if they stated that there was a course on learning outcomes and their relation to course descriptions some 4 years ago – and are not aligned with the learning outcomes of the course descriptors. The SER team was even unable to answer any questions about these matters. Also, the process of an eventual adaptation of learning outcomes was only described as a “constant discussion” during the site visit. A systematic process of checking and adapting learning outcomes seems to be non-existent. Furthermore, it is unclear how the six so-called “Study results (learning outcomes)” are aligned to the Descriptor of the Study Field of Public Administration, in force since 23 July 2015. All in all, the content and methods of the subjects are thus only to a very limited extent appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. It would, therefore, be advisable to construct a matrix linking the Descriptors of the Study Field, the “Study results (learning outcomes)” and the single course descriptors in order to clarify their relationship/interdependence.

After having delivered study time tables at a later stage, it can be confirmed that study subjects are spread evenly and that their themes are not repetitive. Critique has been expressed especially regarding the course “European Union Law”. The SER team acknowledged existing problems and mentioned “bridging courses” for students who do not have a public administration or political science background. Students, however, were neither content with the quality nor with the quantity of law subjects. This is worrying, given that the “study results

(learning outcomes)” state that students should acquire competencies “to put into work EU legal acts and decisions of the institutions of the EU.” It was also somewhat surprising, that the programme authorities in their comments to this report disqualified this as “personal opinion of a few students”, as these were the legitimate representatives of the students supposedly selected by the programme management itself.

The courses are classified by the so-called 5 main groups of courses (SER, p. 7). For a programme that offers a Master degree in Public Administration it is surprising that only one course – Strategic Management and Performance Assessment in the Public Sector – is related to the main group of courses no. 3 (public management courses). Even if the scope of the programme itself is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes, this classification of main courses should thus be thoroughly revised.

Methods used to achieve learning outcomes are on the one hand traditional, on the other hand based on VMU Intranet (First Class) and the distant learning environment Moodle. Students’ evaluations remained, however, without feedback and there were also no meetings with the programme management. This important evaluation information should be systematically collected and used in order to check if learning outcomes are really achieved and to adapt courses accordingly.

Positive is the requirement that students have an obligation to use at least 20 different foreign sources in their Master Thesis. Most course descriptors, therefore, contain English literature, even if in some courses there could be more (e.g. Neighbourhood Policy of the European Union; European Multi-Level Governance; Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union) and in others there is a need to update the references (e.g. European Union Law; Social Policy of the European Union; Public Sector Economics). Based on the information given by the references, the content of the programme only reflects to a certain degree the latest achievements in science, art and technologies.

2.3. Teaching staff

The study programme is provided by the staff meeting legal requirements according to what is presented in the self-evaluation report (SER p. 9). Teaching staff is employed in competition and qualifications required is set by the VMU Senate who will approve the candidates together with the Faculty Council. Attention to competence is firstly graded as academic publications, project writing, research network building and participation in professional seminars and training. Pedagogical competence and experiences is not highlighted in the report. The amount of teaching staff in the master programme is 17 academics: two full professors, seven associated professors, two lecturers with Ph.D. This mean 100% of the Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

teaching staff has a scholar degree. Programme is well provided with teachers giving lectures of their field and research area (64%) and teachers of holding the professor's position (22%) (SER p. 10). The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes and the number of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure learning outcomes.

According to if teaching staff turnover is able to ensure an adequate provision of the programme, average age of teaching staff is 41 years and varies from 30 to 58 years (SER, p. 13). At the site visit the accreditation team got the impression there is this competition focusing on academic writing and research, which seems to be central for the academics. Master students are encouraged to continue into doctoral studies and there are an increasing number of young lecturers, just finished their Ph.D. who have started teaching at the Department (SER, p.10).

Vytautas Magnus University seems to create good conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme especially when it comes to facilities. At the site visit it was pronounced "they put money on the infrastructure and we are waiting for them to put money on people". The impression is teaching staff has a high academic competence and high work load to produce academic publications. The teaching staff of the programme are involved in various research related to the study programme being reviewed. They "attend scientific conferences and participate in academic applied research and training projects" (SER p. 10). This is good but it might take time from pedagogical development and possibilities to develop the programme even further. The pedagogical and teaching experiences among the teaching staff is good though and classes are small (12-15 students per class, SER p. 13), which provide possibilities to develop and implement new pedagogical methods. International exchange is organised through Erasmus programmes, University Bilateral Agreements and personal contacts. During the period of 2015-2016 four teachers were involved in academic mobility. This area, international exchange, both for inviting incoming and for outgoing teachers can be developed, something that is lifted in the self-evaluation report (p.14).

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The faculty is located in a new building and classes for this master programme is mainly given in this building. All together there are 75 study rooms accessible and available for lectures at the campus area, 54 out of this provided with audio and video equipment. Several units have been moved to the new building during 2016. All students and teachers have free access to Internet and the platform Moodle is used. The accreditation team was given a tour on the campus area and made a visit to the new library building as well. Premises for studies seems to be adequate both in their size and quality as well as the teaching and learning equipment

(laboratory and computer equipment, consumables). There is no information to be found in the self-evaluation report, about if VMU has adequate arrangements for students' practice.

VMU has four faculty and one central library as well as a virtual library (VDU Primo), which enables students to find information worldwide through internet. The overall databases (46 in total) are freely available for any user and students are encouraged to use electronical data. This might explain the lack of international, (i.e. English textbooks) about public administration at the library. Mainly using internet based journals, articles and e-books, teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible.

2.5. Study process and student's performance assessment

The admission requirements are founded and organized according to the requirements stated in the Lithuanian Law on Higher Education and Research, as well as admission rules established by the University (Rector) itself. Students may be accepted by competition to state-funded places or take up self-paid places. All information about the programme and admissions regulations is available on the University website. Admission requirements are clear and well understood by all involved groups (administration, students, teachers). However, there are some differences between the information in SER (p.20) (admission formula consists from A, B, C) and in website (admission formula consists from A, B, D, where, D – motivational letter). It would have been appropriate to have informed in SER or site visit if some recent changes were applied.

Students with background of political science or public administration can enter this program without bridging courses. University proposes the opportunity that graduates of other programmes or colleges can be admitted if they finish special bridging courses. The specific rules and the contents of such supplementary programmes are (the rules are provided in website), however, not entirely clear, and can be made more transparent. During the site visit there were said that that students lack of knowledge what bridging courses they could attend if they felt some need.

The programme is a relatively small one, with admissions to the programme over the past five years ranging between 11 (2011) and 10 (2015), in 2014 there was no admission. However, the program is quite attractive, there were 47 applications in 2015. Still there are the risk of not having enough students in the future. The administration is aware of such situation , and have made the decision to admit students only once in two years and also there are plans to make this programme international.

The organisation of the study process does not reach an adequate level of provision and the achievement. There is a lack of dialogue between all key actors. Understanding and involving learning outcomes in programme should be encouraged more. Site visit showed that staff members are aware of learning outcomes but there was a lack of information how different courses meet the main programme learning outcomes during the study process. There was a lack of understanding who is responsible for making all things to go in one direction. Therefore, students, alumni, social partners could be more involved in defining and redefining main goals, that could be helpful for them to understand the main principles.

The students' surveys on quality of teaching are carried out on regular basis. But there was a lack of knowledge (experienced from meeting with students and alumni at the site visit) what is done with those surveys, whether expressed opinion is taken in account. More active engagement of students in evaluating, improving, coordinating and designing the programme should be encouraged, especially when groups are small and it is easy to discuss. This problem relates to all other kind of surveys or important information, not all key actors were well informed or had opportunity to express their views. These finding makes it clear that provision process is not well organised.

There was no clear information in SER about student's participation in research or applied research activities (p. 13-30). There was a lack of clear information whether some conferences especially for students from public administration are organized and how many students from this programme participate. Consequently, it is advisable to make some annual university conferences for students if there are no such activity (the programme authorities informed in their comments to this report that there are indeed since 2012 such activities). From meetings with students and staff there were some evidence that students do participate with teachers in research projects. Some of the teachers have joint articles with students and that is important for the master program. However, this encouragement process seems to be more unofficial and some students and staff may feel left out, or some information about opportunities are not widely shared. More official callings for joining research activities, or annual meetings with students about different opportunities may be helpful to involve students in department activities.

However, variety of other activities for students to feel involved in the society of the University is available at the VMU in forms of discussion clubs, informal discussions, various days and other. It would be a good idea to have some informal events especially to this program, involving staff, alumni, students and social partners.

Students clearly have the opportunity to participate in mobility programmes. Students are able to choose between 23 different countries. However, students do not actively

participate in mobility programmes offered by the Faculty. During the analysed period from year 2011 till 2016 only four students participated in mobility programme. In addition, there were no participants in the last two years. Administration states, that students of the Master studies did not participate in the exchange programmes since many of them are working. Although meeting with the students did not show the evidence for this (three out of four students were not working). Students should be encouraged for going abroad since administration and staff sees this as an important opportunity to widen their knowledge and overall experience. Similarities can be made with teaching staff taking part in academic mobility as mentioned above.

Students receive an adequate level of academic and social support. Academic support includes clear programme information consultations on academic issues. It was clear that teaching staff is easy to reach for academic support, lecturers make themselves available after official consulting hours. The accessibility of teaching staff is valued by students. Student can find their master supervisor easily and get all information needed.

Social support available for students includes dormitory accommodation, scholarships and other social assistance system. The University is committed to supporting students with disabilities and offers accessible facilities.

The assessment system is clear for all groups (staff, students and administration) and is described in the VMU study regulations. Evaluation is carried out per the accumulative grade system. There is opportunity for students to retake the exam or postpone if there are some important reasons. However, the table of 10-point scale for the assessment, which was provided in SER (p. 23) was uninformative. There was lack of information how concrete grade is connected with the achieved learning outcomes. The link between module intended learning outcomes and the assessment method employed is unclear and could be stated more explicitly.

University has clear rules for plagiarism or other forms of cheating. They are publicly available and could be used in practise.

Professional activities of most graduates meet the programme providers' expectations what was proved by alumni (from survey and from the meetings) who emphasized their ability to adapt to the labour market needs in short span of time.

There seems to be a lack of knowledge from social partners what kind of knowledge master students are gaining. The accreditation team got the impression that social partners are satisfied with all students from VMU but they weren't able to say anything specific about students from this concrete master programme.

2.6. Programme management

The structure of programme management as outlined in the self-evaluation report pp. 30-34 is understandable and broadly in line with the general practices of programme management. However, the panel team found discrepancies both from the report and from the practice during the site visit.

For example, the report included an inadequate general distribution of subjects table 1 p. 5 (later corrected) and the general learning outcomes were missing from the respective section p. 6 (these were later provided, in the original version there were only student abilities). This raised questions about the effectiveness and efficacy of the programme management. During the site visit the panel team found multiple cases where the responsibilities seemed to be unclear, e.g.

- Various groups of interviewees (managers, self-evaluation team, teachers etc.) provided different answers for the same questions about role division and internal quality assurance indicating that even if formally present the system is unrecognised in practice.
- When asked about their practical experience with their proposals the answers of the teachers and students were diverse and did not build up an understanding of a system in practice. During the site visit the panel team found no evidence that students are involved in programme management in a systematic manner.
- The self-evaluation team had difficulties to comment on certain aspects of the report during the site visit meeting and there were discussions within the team even when asked about basic facts about the organisation of work.

The responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are formally allocated but it is hard to ensure to what extent this is followed in practice.

The self-evaluation report (p. 35) provides information on the items and regularity of the collection of information and data on the implementation of the programme. During the site visit it was difficult to establish to what extent this is analysed and utilised. When the accreditation team asked to see the annual and three year's programme analysis (SER pp. 35, 36 and 38) this was not provided.

The answers of the academic community during the site visit indicated more informal arrangements as compared to what was described in the self-evaluation report. Informality and ad hoc arrangements were emphasised. There seemed to be much variety in the engagement of teachers.

Alumni and social partners seem to be engaged more on an ad hoc basis. As panel team learned during the site visit, there is no mechanism of informing the students about their Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

feedback and it remained unclear how are students systematically involved in programme development or management. The expert team suggests to develop a more systematic approach ensuring that all relevant actors are adequately engaged and that the information collected will be practically utilised.

University has regularly participated in the national quality assurance system evaluation. With regard to external quality assurance there is a summary of recommendations of the previous, 2008 evaluation and the assessment of the progress in implementing these. There are some aspects where progress is made. Most notably, during the site visit the panel team learned that a new system for motivating teachers in research and publication activities has been introduced and gradually expanded. In many other areas the progress has been partial or modest but its need is acknowledged. Broadly it can be summarised that the outcomes of external evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme.

The discussions during the site visit indicated that the internal quality assurance was mostly approached on an ad hoc basis. There was some discussion about the feedback and ideas of students and teachers during the site visit but it remained unclear to what extent these were considered in practice or how are regular surveys utilised in practice. Some of the outcomes of internal evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme but based on our visit and taking into account the earlier conclusions the review team was not convinced that this is done in a comprehensive and systematic manner.

There were some activities for engaging social partners and the discussions during the site visit indicated that some suggestions from the social partners were implemented, e.g. the expansion of teaching about EU projects and developing the programme towards a more practical approach. We agree with the conclusion of the self-evaluation report that there is much space for further improvement in the involvement of stakeholders, especially employers. The expert team also encourages to develop a more systematic approach here.

In sum, there is an arrangement of programme management but the expert team cannot be sure of its practical relevance, legitimacy and utilisation. There were deficiencies in the self-evaluation report and during the site visit many problematic aspects became visible.

A system for study programme management can be simple and flexible in order to build up as little administrative burden as possible. However, this is reasonable to achieve via designing and following a simple set of rules, not via ad hoc flexibility and unpredictable post hoc adjustments. The rules build up a common roadmap or reference frame for various actors and allow them to co-ordinate their activities. An overall suggestion is to develop a more systematic programme management involving all the relevant actors in a meaningful way and ensure its practical application. A possible way forward could be simplifying the existing

management system to the extent possible within the law and then implementing it consistently.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Programme objectives and learning outcomes are recommended to be clarified. Information should be the same in all available information, in paper or on the Internet.
2. Suggestion is to involve students, alumni and social partners in the process of developing the programme objectives and learning outcomes.
3. Further recommendation is to reorganise and develop a more systematic programme management involving the relevant actors by developing a model with clear responsibilities for different areas.

IV. SUMMARY

The accreditation team had difficulties to find all information required and expressed at the site visit, panel team not satisfied of VMUs preparation of the self-evaluation report. Programme was evaluated 2008 and changes have been made but unclear what and how. Different information is found in the self-evaluation report and at the webpage. There seems to be a lack of organisation and communication between faculty, teachers and students in formal structure and meetings. At the site visit different answers were given from different groups met. Lack of quality and limited information in the self-evaluation report created a lot of new questions and we had to ask for complementary information.

Things, which can be developed in this master programme are:

- Contents of law, and EU regulations can be developed
- Introduction programmes can be developed especially for students coming from other universities or programmes and other countries and academic research methods
- Bridging courses, to get everyone on the same track according to basic knowledge on contents in this field, common used theories.

It is clear programme is important for the University, it is one of the main programmes of the Faculty.

Academic skills (research methods) are well included and expressed by students and are seen in the examples of student's thesis, which was shown to the accreditation team.

There are strongly motivation factors for teachers to write articles and get published, which might take time from teachers developing new teaching methods. A suggestion is to invite and involve students to take part in on-going research projects. It is important students will be prepared not only to do practice and find a job in public sector but also to be prepared of continuing for doctoral studies and further research.

Main positive and negative quality aspects of each programme evaluation area can be summarized as followed:

- Programme objectives and learning outcomes is not as well presented as expected and seems not to be understood by all participants or actors in this programme. There are different versions available, which can explain this. With this clarified, programme objectives and learning outcomes is developing systematically.
- Curriculum design, needs to be improved according to what is said above.
- Teaching staff, competence and experience among teaching staff seems to be very good.
- Facilities and learning resources is good. Faculty have move to a new building this year.

- Study process and student's performance assessment and relevance of feedback mechanism is unclear. If wanting to develop the programme, which needs to be further improved, our recommendation is to take into account students and alumni's experience. To make this easier, we recommend a systematic organisation of taking into account the perspectives of the various stakeholders regarding the current running of the programme as well as its possibilities for reform.
- Programme management is unsatisfactory and needs to be improved.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *European Union Public Policy and Administration* (state code – 621N7003) at Vytautas Magnus University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vertimas iš anglų kalbos

**VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ
PROGRAMOS EUROPOS SĄJUNGOS VIEŠOJI POLITIKA IR ADMINISTRAVIMAS
(VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621N70003)**

2017-03-30 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-59 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto studijų programa *Europos Sąjungos viešoji politika ir administravimas* (valstybinis kodas – 621N70003) vertinama teigiamai.

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

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

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

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

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Ekspertų grupei sunkiai sekėsi rasti visą reikalingą informaciją, o vizito į universitetą metu ji išreiškė nepasitenkinimą VDU darbuotojų parengta savianalizės suvestine. Studijų programa buvo vertinama 2008 m., o vėliau įgyvendinami pokyčiai, tačiau neaišku, kokie ir kaip. Savianalizės suvestinėje ir interneto svetainėje pateikta informacija skiriasi. Tarp fakulteto, dėstytojų ir studentų trūksta formalios struktūros ir susitikimų organizavimo ir bendravimo. Vizito į universitetą metu skirtingos grupės pateikė skirtingus atsakymus. Kokybės trūkumas ir Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

savianalizės suvestinėje pateikta ribota informacija iškėlė daug naujų klausimų, todėl ekspertų grupei teko prašyti papildomos informacijos.

Tobulintini šie magistrantūros studijų programos aspektai:

- Teisės ir ES reglamentų turinys galėtų būti plėtojamas;
- Galima parengti įvadinčius kursus studentams iš kitų universitetų ar kitų studijų programų, taip pat atvykstantiems studijuoti iš kitų šalių ir taikantiems kitokius mokslinių tyrimų metodus;
- Reikalingos išlyginamosios studijos, siekiant suvienodinti bazines šios srities ir dažniausiai taikomų teorijų žinias.

Akivaizdu, kad ši programa yra svarbi universitetui – ji yra viena pagrindinių fakulteto vykdomų studijų programų.

Akademiniai įgūdžiai (tyrimų metodai) yra gerai integruoti ir taikomi studentų, kas buvo akivaizdu ekspertų grupei pateiktuose studentų baigiamųjų darbų pavyzdžiuose.

Dėstytojai labai motyvuoti rašyti ir spausdinti straipsnius, tačiau tai atima laiką, kurį jie galėtų skirti naujiems dėstymo metodams rengti. Rekomenduojama kviesti studentus dalyvauti vykdomuose tyrimų projektuose. Svarbu, kad studentai būtų pasiruošę ne tik atlikti praktiką ir susirasti darbą viešajame sektoriuje, bet ir tęsti studijas doktorantūroje ir vykdyti tolesnius tyrimus.

Pagrindiniai teigiami ir neigiami kiekvienos studijų programos vertinimo srities kokybės aspektai yra šie:

- Studijų programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai nėra taip gerai pateikti, kaip tikimasi, ir atrodo, kad juos supranta ne visi šios studijų programos dalyviai. Tą galima paaiškinti skirtingų versijų buvimu. Ištaisius šiuos trūkumus, programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai būtų sistemiškai plėtojami.
- Programos sandara yra tobulintina, atsižvelgiant į pirmiau pateiktas pastabas.
- Dėstytojai, jų kompetencija ir patirtis vertinami labai gerai.
- Materialieji ištekliai yra geri. Šiais metais fakultetas persikėlė į naują pastatą.
- Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas, taip pat grįžtamojo mechanizmo svarba neaiškūs. Norint tobulinti programą, kurią tikrai reikia gerinti, rekomenduojama atsižvelgti į studentų ir absolventų nuomonę. Kad būtų lengviau tai įgyvendinti, rekomenduojama sistemingai rinkti įvairių socialinių dalininkų nuomones apie studijų programos vykdymą ir tobulinimo galimybes.
- Programos vadyba nepatenkinama, todėl šią sritį reikia tobulinti.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Rekomenduojama aiškiau suformuluoti studijų programos uždavinius ir studijų rezultatus. Informacija turėtų būti vienoda visuose šaltiniuose – popieriniuose dokumentuose ir interneto svetainėje.
2. Siūloma įtraukti studentus, absolventus ir socialinius partnerius formuluojant studijų programos uždavinius ir studijų rezultatus.
3. Taip pat rekomenduojama pertvarkyti ir sukurti sistemingesnę programos vadybą, įtraukiant atitinkamus dalyvius ir parengiant aiškaus atsakomybės už skirtingas sritis paskirstymo modelį.

<...>

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)