



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETO
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *VALSTYBĖS INSTITUCIJŲ*
ADMINISTRAVIMAS (*valstybinis kodas – 621N70004*)**
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC GOVERNANCE
INSTITUTIONS (*state code – 621N70004*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
At VYTAUTAS MAGNUS UNIVERSITY

1. Prof. Michiel de Vries (the Chair of the Team), *academic*,
2. Dr. Christine Leitner, *academic*,
3. Assoc. Prof. Iwona Sobis, *academic*,
4. Assoc. Prof. Rasa Šnapštienė, *academic*
5. Mr Lukas Borusevičius, *students' representative*.

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Valstybės institucijų administravimas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621N70004
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Viešasis administravimas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Viešojo administravimo magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	Lietuvos Respublikos švietimo ir mokslo ministro 2007 m. vasario 19 d. įsakymu Nr. ISAK-225

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Administration of Public Governance Institutions</i>
State code	621N70004
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 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Public Administration
Date of registration of the study programme	19 th February 2007, under the order of the Minister of the Ministry for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania No. ISAK-225

© 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	10
2.3. Teaching staff	12
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	12
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	13
2.6. Programme management	15
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	16
IV. SUMMARY.....	17
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	18

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of evaluation process

This report is to give the reader the outcomes of an evaluation of a Master programme in the field of Public Administration provided by Vytautas Magnus University (hereafter, VMU) in Kaunas, Lithuania. The evaluation is primarily based on a Self-evaluation Report (hereafter, the SER) prepared by the Department and a site visit by a Review Panel on October 21st, 2014.

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 during the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	Several examples of the exams of the study subjects within the programme
2.	The schedule of all the study subjects on the Master programme
3.	Several examples of Master theses produced by students on the programme

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

The Master programme is a two-year programme entitled *Administration of Public Governance Institutions* and is implemented by the Department of Public Administration based within the Faculty of Political Science and Diplomacy of Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas, Lithuania.

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 21st October, 2014.

1. Prof. Michiel de Vries (the Chair of the Team)

The Chair in Public Administration at the Radboud University of Nijmegen, the President of IASIA, the Netherlands.

2. Dr. Christine Leitner

Senior Advisor, Centre for Economics and Public Administration, UK , Advisor Ministry of Research, Science and Economy, Austria

3. Assoc. Prof. Iwona Sobis

Associate Professor at the School of Public Administration, Gothenburg University, Sweden.

4. Assoc. Prof. Rasa Šnapštienė

Associate Professor at the Institute of Public Policy and Administration, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania.

5. Mr Lukas Borusevičius

Student of the Law and Management study programme at Mykolas Romeris University (first cycle studies), Lithuania.

The Review Panel had a busy day and talked to many stakeholders at the site visit: the Head of the Department, the Vice Dean, and the International Relations Coordinator of the Faculty. The Panel also had meetings with the administrative staff, the teaching staff, students, social partners/employers and alumni. Besides these meetings, the Review Panel also visited the University library, looked at lecture rooms and made an analysis of selected examples of exams, Master theses and student-assessments provided by the Department. The Panel members were welcomed in a hospitable way and the site visit itself was well organised by the Department, although it was unfortunate that only two students participated in the meeting with the Review Panel.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The Master programme under evaluation wants to be evaluated as a second cycle study programme in Public Administration. The study of Public Administration is a relatively young and interdisciplinary study. It is interdisciplinary in the sense that it is normally situated between and incorporates knowledge from Economics, Political Science, Law, and Sociology. A central feature in Public Administration is the integration of theories and outcomes of research from these four disciplines in order to understand the internal workings (organisation) and external workings (policy-making) of the public sector. Every organisation/policy area faces economic constraints, and in the public sector there are always politico-administrative relations. Its work is by definition bound by legislation and its primary function is to face the challenges posed by the dynamics in society. For these reasons knowledge of all the above mentioned disciplines is crucial for a thorough understanding of Public Administration. Public Administration integrates and applies these disciplines, especially in its research, into three areas: Public Management, Public Administration and Public Policy Making.

Another important aspect that distinguishes Public Administration from other academic disciplines is its pragmatic character. In Public Administration scholars do not just develop theories, test them and apply them in their research area for the sake of furthering scholarly knowledge (although this is important as well), but rather apply these insights to practice in order to improve the workings of the public sector, and thus advise and assist the public sector in resolving pressing societal problems. In addition, in the practice of Public Administrators, public servants need to be able to talk to a variety of stakeholders, and they have to be mediators between different actors primarily concerned with legislation, economics, and politics, as well as societal actors.

Internationally – the European Association of Public Administration Accreditation (EAPAA) and the Commission on International Accreditation of Public Administration (CIAPA) have agreed on a minimum set of subjects which each Public Administration programme should address. These subjects involve:

- The Management of Public Service Organisations, including human resource management, budgeting and financial processes, information management, new technology applications, and policy, administrative and constitutional law, effective

- communication skills, organization and management concepts and behaviour, and not for profit and private sector relationships and grant management;
- Improvement of Public Sector Processes, including the development of high performing organisations, management of networks and partnerships, the delivery of public goods and services, management of projects and contracts, supporting workforce diversity, and motivation and design of public sector organisations;
 - Leadership in the Public Sector, including creative and innovative problem solving, leading institutional and organisational transformation, conflict prevention and resolution strategies, promoting equity in service delivery, developing approaches to poverty alleviation, promoting democratic institutional development and public sector ethics;
 - The Application of Quantitative and Qualitative Techniques of Analysis, including institutional and developmental economics, policy and programme formulation, analysis, implementation and evaluation, decision-making and problem-solving, and strategic planning;
 - Explanation of Public Policy and the Organisational Environment, including political and legal institutions and processes, economic and social institutions and processes, historical and cultural context, the management of economic development, the implications of the “third party government”, and acknowledging and reconciling cultural diversity.

The Review Panel compared these standards with the contents of the Master programme under evaluation. Based on the contents of the programme (cf. the SER) and the meeting with the programme Management Team, the Review Panel understands that the Management Team of the Master programme intends to provide a competence profile that is broad in scope and targets future local public officials, at the national, and/or European level. According to the Management Team, the teachers and the students, the idea is to educate “generalists” who will be able to apply theoretical approaches to different policy areas. Also according to the SER, the programme aims “...to prepare highly qualified public administration specialists, experts and analysts of public governance, public policy implementation and public governance institutions” (see the SER p. 6).

The actual content of the programme, however, does not reflect these objectives in their entirety since the curriculum does not cover the full scope of Public Administration subjects. This is also reflected in the mismatch between the skills requirements for Public Administration and the content offered. While the content detailed in the individual study subject descriptions is of high quality and demanding (see SER, Annex 2), the focus of the programme is mainly on public

policy processes and the study of theory on that subject. The curriculum lacks core Public Administration components such as leadership and management, and related skills.

Regarding the intended learning outcomes, the SER states that “After completion of the study programme, a student should...5) Be capable to independently plan, organize and perform activities of the public sector institution, introduce organisational or managerial innovations ... 6) Be disposed to initiate and implement policy changes, institutional reforms, act as a leader ...” (see SER p. 6) These intended learning outcomes are not sufficiently reflected in the curriculum in the view of the Panel.

In addition, as opposed to what is stated as the intended learning outcome 2) in the SER, i.e. that a student should “Be able to identify means of policy formation and implementation, to use them in practice”, the programme in general lacks links to practice, and does not provide sufficient practical skills (c.f. information provided in the SER, but also the discussions at the site visit with students, alumni and social partners).

The reply of the Management Team of the programme at the site visit to these critical points was that these components form part of the individual study subjects. However, the Review Panel could not get clarity during the site visit to what extent the provided study subjects actually contain these core topics and skills (such as e.g. management and leadership) beyond what is described in the SER.

Another reason could be that it is presumed that students have followed a Bachelor on Public Administration before and if coming from a different discipline have to follow a Pre-Master programme in which these “missing” subjects are covered. However, the Review Panel talked to students and learned that even if they had a different background they did not need to follow the Pre-Master programme before entering this Master programme.

Based on the above observations and talks, the Review Panel concludes as follows: the name of the study programme does not capture the content of the curriculum since the curriculum does not cover the full scope of Public Administration subjects; there is a lack of consistency between the programme aims and the intended learning outcomes on the one hand and the type and level of studies and the name of the qualification actually offered on the other; the programme aims and the intended learning outcomes are neither based on the academic and/or professional requirements, the public needs and the needs of the labour market to the extent required by international nor do they fully comply with the international standards for Public Administration

programmes (as described above on p. 7.). They may be well-defined and clearly written down in the SER, but reality is different.

Therefore, the Review Panel recommends to rethink the content of the programme to bring it in line with international standards on what a programme in Public Administration entails, or change the name of the programme into a *Public Policy* (and hence change the study field to Political Sciences), because that is, in the view of the Review Panel, what the programme at present actually is.

Because the Master programme in *Administration of Public Governance Institutions* focuses mainly on public policy, the score for evaluation area “Programme aims and learning outcomes” should be ‘2’, as the programme Management Team needs to make the necessary improvements to ensure that the study subjects provided in the programme are consistent with the scope of the content required for this type and level of studies. This means that the content needs to fully reflect the achievements in the discipline of Public Administration. As mentioned above, in the opinion of the Review Panel, in its present design, the curriculum rather corresponds to a Master in Public Policy than to a Master in Public Administration. The programme in its present form could – in the opinion of the Review Panel – be evaluated as “good” (i.e. a score ‘3’ on this criterion), if it was presented under a different title (and hence in a different study field, namely Political Sciences).

2.2. Curriculum design

As to the curriculum design, it does meet the legal requirements¹ as it is a two-year programme with in total 120 ECTS: 60 ECTS are from the compulsory study field subjects (the legal requirement is not less than 60 ECTS), 18 ECTS are prescribed to free electives (the legal requirement is not more than 30 ECTS), 6 ECTS are prescribed to Research Paper 1, 6 ECTS – to Research Paper 2 and 30 ECTS – to the Master Thesis (the legal requirement is not less than 30 ECTS). It is seen as positive that all study subjects are of the same size, 6 ECTS, 30 ECTS per semester, with 30 ECTS for the Master thesis to be written during the fourth semester. The Review Panel evaluated it as one of the strengths of the programme.

In the Master programme of *Administration of Public Governance Institutions*, students are expected to write three papers:

¹ Order of the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania, namely “General Requirements of Master Degree Study Programmes”.

- Research Paper No 1 (6 ECTS);
- Research Paper No 2 (6 ECTS);
- Master Thesis (it is not a separate study subject, 30 ECTS).

The Review Panel noticed that none of the mentioned courses has a syllabus or description. Hence the specific intended learning outcomes for the research papers and the Master theses are unknown. Furthermore, the Review Panel noticed that the sequence is not consistent, as the study subject in research methods is found at the end of the programme in the third semester, while the research papers have to be written in the first two semesters. It would have been more logical to reverse this sequence, i.e. first the study subject on research methods and afterwards the research papers.

In addition, the Review Panel understands that all stakeholders would welcome more practical skills and better preparation of the students for the labour market. That could be accomplished by, among others, an internship and guest-lectures by practitioners. Although alumni and potential employers told the Review Panel that they would be willing to do so, guest lecturers appeared to be rare and, if organized, took place outside the regular schedule, and were not aimed at students in this programme, but were offered for all students at the University. Furthermore, the Review Panel regrets that there is no possibility to get practical experience through an internship, of which especially students who do not work would benefit.

Little or no use is made of the alumni network to establish better links to practice. The SER mentions in this regard that the students' feedback points to a lack of practical skills and links to practitioners which they consider relevant for their jobs/careers in the public sector. Regarding this point, the teachers could make more use of examples from practice in Lithuania and offer contacts with and involve practitioners (e.g. through excursions, study visits, regular talks/chats on current topics).

In this context, the programme would also benefit from further internationalization. This could be accomplished through the introduction of classes in English by guest lecturers (from academia and practice, potentially using online lectures/courses to address the budget constraints mentioned in the SER), but also through a wider use of international case studies and experiences in the existing study subjects (which has been done to some extent following the last external evaluation). A review of the teaching methods and curriculum design might be beneficial. From the descriptions in Annex 2 of the SER the teaching methods appear to be rather traditional.

Although the Review Panel has recommendations to improve the programme, and although – as mentioned under the previous evaluation area – the contents do not suffice for a curriculum in Public Administration, the curriculum design as such is good. Therefore, the score for this evaluation area should be ‘3’.

2.3. Teaching staff

The Review Panel received information on the requirements (including the legal requirements) for the academic teaching staff, regarding the qualifications of the teachers – not less than 80% of all study subjects teachers must have a PhD, their experience in teaching (which needs to be extensive), and their scholarly research (which has to have resulted in output in Lithuanian and international journals in Public Administration). In the Review Panel’s opinion, these criteria are very good. The teachers made an impression that they are competent and committed. The programme has a qualified and interdisciplinary teaching staff: The Review Panel received the resumes of the teaching staff showing that they have a PhD degree, have extensive experience, either internationally or in practice of Public Administration and that they publish, although the resumes do not always reveal publications in international ISI journals (cf. the SER). Teaching staff are encouraged to do research and are involved in a variety of research activities. According to the discussions with the teachers at the site visit, not all of them have practical experience in Public Administration and/or involve practitioners in their study subjects, but they did express interest in doing so in the future. Regarding teaching methods and mandatory readings, practices differ among the study subjects and it mostly depends on the teachers. According to the students’ opinions, some lecturers are especially appreciated, because they use innovative teaching methods, they encourage students to be more involved in the study process, and they stimulate students to think critically by using scientific literature combined with more concrete tasks. They also use a broad range of English literature in their study subjects.

The Review Panel concludes that the programme has a very competent staff for the provision of the programme. The score for this evaluation area should be therefore ‘4’.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The main building where lectures are given and the library are well equipped and are currently undergoing a further development. The Review Panel visited good teaching facilities with lecturing rooms having the needed facilities in terms of computers, projectors, and blackboard, access to the Internet. Furthermore, students have easy access to Wi-Fi in all the buildings of

VMU. The buildings are located in different places in Kaunas, but in a relatively close proximity to each other. According to the SER, several computer classes (at S. Daukanto St. 28 and K. Donelaičio St. 52) with in total 70 workplaces are available for the seminars in specific study subjects. Also the library is well-equipped, as it subscribes to full text online licensed databases, and offers e-books and e-journals, which are available for the university community via Internet.

The facilities, equipment and learning resources are therefore adequate. New library facilities will be opened at the end of this year. They will provide additional work space for students. The Review Panel noted that according to discussions with staff the trend is towards the use of e-books and e-journals. Reading and teaching materials as well as other course information is usually provided on Moodle. The individual work space for teaching staff is limited.

Given the new developments and what the Review Panel learned during the site visit, the conclusion is that the facilities are very good and the score for this evaluation area should be '4'.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

In the Review Panel's point of view, the way this Master programme deals with this criterion is a matter of serious concern. The SER gives an overview of grades the students receive, which reveals very high grades, namely on average 9.23 on a scale from 0-10 in 2013. This is extremely high. It could of course be caused by extreme excellence of the students, but the Panel is not convinced that this is the case.

The Review Panel discussed this issue with staff and students and checked the exam questions, as well as the level of analysis in the Master theses, especially those Master theses rewarded with the highest score possible, namely 10.

The students told the Panel that they had to study on average only two hours a day, less than 10 hours a week, which is indicative for a very light study load. When the Panel asked them how that is possible given the enormous amount of literature mentioned as required reading in the descriptions of the study subjects, it proved that only a small part of that literature actually needs to be read and studied.

The Review Panel also investigated a sample of examinations of various study subjects provided by the Management Team during the site visit. It proved that hardly any questions were asked about students' knowledge of theories, about theoretical or practical explanations, or about

critical analyses, and that most questions were descriptive, asking, for instance, about who is responsible for something, or in which countries something is the case.

A riposte could be that the Panel had a look at only a part of the examinations. However, these were the examinations provided to the Panel as a sample by the programme Management Team. Therefore, the Panel could expect these examinations to be exemplary. The Review Panel has to conclude that the level of questioning in examinations does not fulfil the minimum standards.

Also the level of analysis as shown in the Master theses – even in those graded with 10 – were below the Panel's expectations. When quantitative research was done, only descriptive graphs were provided and any bivariate or multivariate analysis was absent. When qualitative analyses were done, the use of international articles and books remained minimal. The level of the Master theses did not exceed what is normally seen in Bachelor theses.

The assessment system of students' performance may be clear on paper, but it is not in reality and needs to be improved. The Review Panel therefore has to conclude that the assessment system of students' performance is a matter of concern and that the organisation of the study process cannot ensure an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes (these are two important sub-criteria of a total of 7 in this evaluation area), because the grading of students in this programme is inflated. The programme does not challenge the students enough, and therefore there are doubts whether students really achieve the learning outcomes as intended.

As to another sub-criterion – the admission requirements – this was already addressed under evaluation area 1 – Programme aims and learning outcomes. There it became clear to the Panel that on paper the admission requirements may be well-founded, such as the requirement to have to follow the Pre-Master programme in case the student has a Bachelor in a different discipline, but the site visit revealed that the admission requirements do not correspond to the practice, as the Panel talked to students who had a very different background, and were nonetheless not obliged to follow the Pre-Master programme.

Given the above, the score for this evaluation area should be '2'. Attention should be paid to the fact that it is a very weak 2, since the shortcomings are quite significant, but the Review Panel would like to give the programme Management Team the opportunity to upgrade the performance assessment of students.

2.6. Programme management

As to the formal criteria for the management of the programme (i.e. the clear allocation of responsibilities, the collection and analysis of information and data about the implementation of the programme, the use of evaluations to improve the programme, and the involvement of stakeholders), information provided in the SER suggests that these are adequate.

The Panel noticed that the Department in which the Master programme is implemented has a new Head in function for only two months at the time of the site visit. This implies that some coordination issues are still likely to be solved.

The Review Panel nevertheless would like to point out a few challenges: the first challenge is found in balancing gender-relations among the staff-members. Not only are female lecturers a minority, the Panel observed during the site visit a masculine dominance when answering questions, with the female-staff hardly getting the opportunity to express their opinions. The second challenge is to improve the communication between the Faculty personnel, the personnel of the Master programme, the management of the Department and the teaching staff. The third challenge is that too little has been done until now to develop good relations with the students, social partners and alumni in order to involve them in the Master programme. Although the SER claims to have a system in place (see the SER p. 28), in reality a structured mechanism to collect feedback from students, alumni and social partners is lacking, despite the interest that has been demonstrated by them during the site visit. The students are not informed about what happens with their feedback and social partners seem to be consulted only on an ad hoc basis.

Because the Review Panel wants to give the new Head of Department the opportunity to improve on these aspects of management, and the management on paper seems adequate, the score for this evaluation area should be '3'.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Either modify the content of the programme so that it provides the full range of the minimum requirements of a Master programme in Public Administration (as described in section II.2.1), or change the name of the programme in *Public Policy* (and hence the study field to Political Sciences).
2. Rethink the sequence in which different study subjects are taught. Especially the current position of Research Methods study subject is not consistent.
3. Invite more guest lecturers – international scholars, as well as practitioners – to teach or be actively involved in the study subjects. This would be beneficial with regard to a better preparation of students to the labour market.
4. Rethink whether an internship is possible on the programme, preferably in combination with the Master thesis.
5. Add more skills training to the programme (see comments in section II.2.1), not just in writing papers and making presentations, but also other skills (such as on management and leadership).
6. Make the programme more demanding by giving more attention to students' theoretical knowledge, their analytical skills and critical capacities during examinations and by requiring them to conduct more advanced analyses in Master theses.
7. Management should make efforts to improve the communication between all stakeholders and try to establish gender balance among staff.

IV. SUMMARY

The Review Panel has evaluated the Master programme on *Administration of Public Governance Institutions* which is implemented by the Department of Public Administration at the Faculty of Political Science and Diplomacy of Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas, Lithuania and the sections above provide the main observations and conclusions of the Review Panel.

The main problems lie in the content of the study programme which does not match with the name of the programme and in the assessment of students as reflected in the grading. As to the first point, if the programme should be evaluated as a Public Administration study programme and an international Panel has been invited to conduct the evaluation, it is to be expected that the contents of the programme is compared to the minimum requirements of Public Administration programmes applied internationally. In this regard, the current contents of the Master on *Administration of Public Governance Institutions* does not yet comply with the full range of these minimum standards. The Review Panel rather considers this study programme as a Master programme in *Public Policy*.

As to the assessment of students' progress, the Review Panel notices grade inflation and that students are not challenged enough. The study load for students could be much higher.

All this does present a huge challenge for the management of the programme and especially the new Head of the Department. However, given the very positive evaluation by the Review Panel of the quality of the staff, the Panel is convinced that the recommendations will be followed-up adequately in a short term.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Administration of Public Governance Institutions* (state code – 621N70004) at Vytautas Magnus 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	3
3.	Teaching staff	4
4.	Facilities and learning resources	4
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	18

*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. Michiel de Vries
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Dr. Christine Leitner
	Assoc. Prof. Iwona Sobis
	Assoc. Prof. Rasa Šnapštienė
	Mr Lukas Borusevičius

**VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ
PROGRAMOS *VALSTYBĖS INSTITUCIJŲ ADMINISTRAVIMAS* (VALSTYBINIS
KODAS – 621N70004) 2014-12-30 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-612
IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto studijų programa *Valstybės institucijų administravimas* (valstybinis kodas – 621N70004) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	4
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	4
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	18

* 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 grupė įvertino Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto Politikos mokslų fakulteto Viešojo administravimo katedroje vykdomą magistrantūros studijų programą *Valstybės institucijų administravimas*. Ankstesniuose skyriuose yra pateikiamos pagrindinės ekspertų grupės pastabos ir apibendrinimai.

Pagrindiniai ekspertų identifikuoti trūkumai yra susiję su studijų programos turiniu, kuris nedera su programos pavadinimu, ir, kaip rodo pažymiai, su studentų vertinimu. Dėl pirmojo trūkumo, jei studijų programa turėtų būti vertinama kaip viešojo administravimo krypties programa, ir jos vertinimui buvo pakviesta tarptautinė ekspertų grupė, tikimasi, kad šios programos turinys atitiks tarptautinius *Viešojo administravimo* studijų programoms keliamus minimalius reikalavimus.

Pažymėtina, kad kol kas studijų programa neatitinka visų minimalių viešojo administravimo studijų programoms keliamų reikalavimų. Ši studijų programa, ekspertų grupės nuomone, yra labiau orientuota į viešąją politiką.

Ekspertų grupė, vertindama studentų pažangą, atkreipė dėmesį, kad studentai gauna nepagrįstai aukštus įvertinimus. Atitinkamai galima daryti prielaidą, kad studentams keliami nepakankamai aukšti reikalavimai. Studentų darbo krūvis galėtų būti žymiai didesnis.

Dėl visų paminėtų studijų programos silpnybių, už programos vykdymą atsakingi asmenys, ypač naujasis katedros vedėjas, susiduria su dideliais iššūkiais. Vis dėlto, atsižvelgiant į tai, kad programos dėstytojų kompetencija buvo įvertinta labai gerai, ekspertų grupė yra įsitikinusi, kad jų pateiktos rekomendacijos trumpuoju laikotarpiu bus įgyvendintos tinkamai.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Arba pakoreguoti studijų programos turinį, siekiant jo atitikimo minimaliems viešojo administravimo magistrantūros programoms keliamiems reikalavimams (kaip aprašyta išorinio vertinimo išvadų II dalies 2.1 punkte), arba pakeisti studijų programos pavadinimą iš *Valstybės institucijų administravimas* į *Viešojo politika* (atitinkamai turėtų būti pakeista ir studijų kryptis – iš viešojo administravimo į politikos mokslų).
2. Peržiūrėti studijų dalykų seką studijų programoje. Šiuo metu daugiausia problemų kyla dėl studijų dalyko Tyrimo metodai pozicijos studijų plane pagrįstumo.
3. Kviestis daugiau vizituojančio akademinio personalo – užsienio mokslininkų, praktikų, kurie dėstyti arba būtų kitaip įsitraukę į studijų procesą. Tai padėtų studentus geriau parengti integravimuisi į darbo rinką.
4. Persvarstyti, ar šioje studijų programoje būtų įmanoma įtraukti praktiką, pageidautina derinant ją su magistro baigiamųjų darbų rengimu.
5. Padidinti studijų programoje ugdomų gebėjimų skaičių (žr. vertinimo išvadų II dalies 2.1 punkte pateiktas pastabas); studentams nepakanka rengti vien tik rašto darbus ir prezentacijas, reikėtų lavinti ir kitus jų įgūdžius (pavyzdžiui, vadybos ir lyderystės).
6. Studijų programa turėtų būti sudėtingesnė. Egzaminų metu daugiau dėmesio turėtų būti skiriama studentų teorinėms žinioms, gebėjimui analizuoti ir kritiškai mąstyti, taip pat studentai magistro baigiamuosiuose darbuose turėtų atlikti aukštesnio lygio analizę.

7. Už programos vykdymą atsakingi asmenys turėtų daugiau dėmesio skirti bendradarbiavimo su socialiniais dalininkais stiprinimui bei siekti geresnio vyrų ir moterų skaičiaus santykio tarp darbuotojų.

<...>

Paslaugos teikėjas patvirtina, jog yra susipažinęs su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso² 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

² Žin., 2002, Nr.37-1341.