



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

LIETUVOS EDUKOLOGIJOS UNIVERSITETO
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *BIOLOGIJA*
(valstybinis kodas – 621C10003)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *BIOLOGY* (state code - 621C10003)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at LITHUANIAN UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

1. **Dr. scient Trine Johansen, Meza (team leader)** *academic*
2. **Prof. dr. Maris Klavins**, *academic*
3. **Prof. dr. Borut Bohanec**, *academic*
4. **Prof. dr. Jacques J.M. van Alphen**, *academic*
5. **Prof. dr. Sigitas Podėnas**, *academic and representative of social partners*
6. **Inga Kalpakovaitė**, *students' representative*

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Biologija
Valstybinis kodas	621C10003
Studijų sritis	Biomedicinos mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Biologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Biologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2001-08-02, įsakymo nr. 1187

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Biology
State code	621C10003
Study area	Biomedical sciences
Study field	Biology
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 Biology
Date of registration of the study programme	2 nd of August 2001, Order no. 1187

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process.....	4
1.2. General.....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information.....	5
1.4. The Review Team.....	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	6
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	6
2.2. Curriculum design	7
2.3. Teaching staff	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	10
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	11
2.6. Programme management	12
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
IV. SUMMARY	14
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	15

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.	H-indexes of the staff teaching in the programme (table) (EN)
2.	Qualification requirements for teaching staff positions set by Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (LT)
3.	Regulations on the performance assessment of the pedagogical and research staff, and on the order of organising open competitions at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (LT)

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

The second-cycle study programme of *Biology* is implemented at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (LEU), in the Department of Biology at the Faculty of Sciences and Technology (FST). The faculty consists of seven departments, the Institute of Natural Science Research and other divisions such as the Greenhouse, CISCO Academy and ECDL Test Centre. The study programme aims at meeting the demands of qualified specialist in the society and this study programme is the only study programme in Lithuania that does not specialise in a narrow branch of biology. The graduates from the study programme are able to continue with the third cycle (Ph.D) studies.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was composed according to the *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No 1-55 of 19 March 2007 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education, as amended on 11 November 2011. The team conducted the Review Visit to The Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences on Friday 10th October 2014.

- 1. Dr. scient Trine Johansen Meza (team leader)**, *Assistant Deputy Director General, Department of Quality Assurance, Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education, Norway*
- 2. Prof. dr. Maris Klavins**, *Department of Environmental sciences, University of Latvia, Latvia*
- 3. Prof. dr. Borut Bohanec**, *Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia*
- 4. Prof. dr. Jacques J.M. van Alphen**, *Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Dynamics at the University of Amsterdam and the Netherlands Centre for Biodiversity, Netherlands*
- 5. Prof. dr. Sigitas Podėnas**, *Head of the Laboratory of Entomology, Nature research Centre, Lithuania*
- 6. Inga Kalpakovaitė (student representative)**, *graduate of Vilnius University, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Lithuania*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The aim of the study programme is to educate highly qualified and open-minded specialists in biology who will meet the demand of the society. Having acquired the second cycle university education, the graduates from the programme will be able to continue in the third cycle studies. The Study Programme Committee has revised the aim of the programme as well as the indented learning outcomes, taking into account the Lithuanian Qualification Framework and other guidelines. According to the self-evaluation report (hereafter – SER), the Study Programme Committee has taken into account the social partners to meet the demand of the public needs during the revision process.

There are written five learning outcomes (hereafter – LO) of the study programme, and every LO is covering several aspects. This fact was discussed during the site-visit, as the expert panel initially found that it could be better if the LO were written in a different manner. However, during the discussions it became clear that this was a well-informed choice made by the institution that is in alignment with the Lithuanian guidelines, and the expert panel thereby conclude that the LO are consistent with the level and type of study offered. On the other hand, the expert panel finds it necessary for the Study Programme Committee to go through the intended LO and assure that all the students taking the study programme will be able to achieve the indented LO. Learning outcome 2 stated that “*the students will be able to not only identify and analyse problems of biological diversity, **human biology**,*”. By analysing the contents of the study programme, the expert panel found that the human biology is given mainly in an elective course, and students that do not choose this course, will not be able to reach this LO. The SER states that the study programme is the only programme in Lithuania that does not specialise in a specific area of biology. The expert panel finds the broad scope of the programme challenging as it would be impossible for the students to achieve a competence at the master’s level in a broad range of biological sciences. The expert panel thereby thinks that the university should make a programme that reflects the competence of the teaching staff. In this manner, the programme will get a more narrow profile, and the quality of the programme will probably be higher.

The learning outcomes of the study programme is according to the SER (page 10), published on the website of the Department of Biology. In addition the learning outcomes are published on the

Facebook site of the study programme, as well as published in publications, booklets and leaflets of the University. The Department of Biology in addition informs prospective students at exhibitions as well as by phone and e-mail. The expert panel thereby concludes that the learning outcomes are publicly available.

The name of the programme, master degree in Biology is considered by the expert panel to be rather wide, as the programme does not cover all the different aspects of Biology. The learning outcomes are also very broad, and it will not be possible for the students to fully achieve the intended learning outcomes at the level of a master degree given the current curriculum design (see more detailed analysis of this in chapter 2.2).

2.2. Curriculum design

The programme meets legal requirements of a master's degree programme, as the duration of the programme is 2 years (120 credits) and the number of subjects given per semester does not exceed four. The volume of the study credits given per semester is thereby 30. The credits allocated to the Master thesis are 44, divided between Scientific Research Practise and Master's thesis writing and defence.

The study subjects are spread evenly in the study programme, and their themes are not repetitive. However, the expert panel finds that the scope of the programme is too broad, and thereby the students will not be able to achieve competences at the master degree level in all the different areas that are covered in the programme.

For the first three semesters the programme consists of three study subjects in the study field each semester and an elective subject. The fourth semester is allocated to the Master's thesis work.

In the subject descriptions, it is evident that for some of the subjects, the learning outcomes stated to be the LO of the study programme are not correct. For example, for the subject "*Lithuanian Vegetation (Master's training workshop)*", all the LO is actually LO from the Bachelor's programme, the same is true for the subject "*Economic Botany*".

In the obligatory subject, "*Contemporary Biotechnology*" (Annex 3.1), there are no practical classes, and it would be difficult for the students to be on master degree level for example in the topic "*Plant and animal genetic engineering*", without doing any experimental work.

For the elective study subject “*Human biology*“ (Annex 3.1), the goal of the subject is “*good understanding of the essence of human biology, scientific research work in the field of human biology science knowledge to themselves to carry out some research*“, while the study subject covers topics like “*Human ontogenesis*“ and “*Human complex cognitive object*“, while other areas of human biology are not covered. One of the study methods in this subject is “*practical research work report*“, while the plan of the study subject does not state anything about practical research. Based on the examples above, the study programme committee has to go through the subject descriptions to assure that the name of the subjects align with the content of the subject and the LO of the study programme and as well as the LO of the subject. The expert panel think that the University could look into the possibility to make a joint programme with another university in order to be able to give the students a good Master’s degree programme.

Analysis of the Master’s degree thesis work revealed that most of the work is descriptive, and the expert panel would encourage that the students do more experimental work.

The teaching methods used in the subjects are analysis of scientific literature, lectures, discussion, oral presentations, field research practise and so forth. These are teaching methods that are commonly used, and it is thereby sufficient. As stated above, it may seem like there is too little laboratory work in some of the subjects. The contact hours between teachers and students are relatively high, and this means that much of the teachers time are used for teaching, and there will not be enough time for research. Using more efficient teaching methods would give the teachers more time for research. Another point is the small number of students entering the programme, this means that the students have to choose the electives as a group. The expert panel thinks that this is quite problematic and also thinks that the university should look if it would be possible to give some of the courses using distant learning so that the courses could be chosen even if there are only a few students.

2.3. Teaching staff

The teaching staff consists of 14 teachers, including two full professors (Doctors Habiliatus), 2 full professors (with Ph.D), 9 associate professors and one lecturer with a Ph.D. In addition to this, there are visiting professors from USA, Czech Republic etc. The teachers of the programme have also been on exchange abroad, for example to Belarus, Germany and England. The Self-evaluation group still has considered this as a weakness as the possibilities have not been exploited fully. The expert panel agrees with the point that more active exchange abroad would increase the quality of the study programme. The teaching staff meets the legal requirements as

no less than 80 % of the teaching staff should be scientists, and in the Master programme in Biology, all the teachers hold a Ph.D.

The teaching staff improves their qualifications through the participation in seminars, trainings and qualification improvement classes. As stated in the SER and as elaborated on during the site-visit, there is a system of teacher mentoring where individual teachers get feedback from colleagues that have attended their classes. This is performed both in a formal and informal manner, and in the opinion of the expert panel this is a good system for improving the pedagogical skills of the teaching staff.

Analysis of the SER shows that the teaching staff is attending quite a few different conferences. Some of these seems however to be more suitable for the teacher's education in Biology given at LEU, such as *"The Professional Development of Teacher Educators: Bringing Together Policy, Practice and Research"* (SER, page 17). The expert panel thereby thinks that it is of vast importance that the teaching staff attends even more research conferences in their specific field that is targeted to more specific areas. The panel does of course appreciate that the staff is also teaching at the BA level and that some of the conferences attended are important for that part of their work. The teaching staff is in addition involved in different internship at different foreign universities, which is considered positive.

The number of students entering the programme has become lower the last few years, and according to this fact, the number of staff per student is quite high, something that is considered positive both from the students and teachers.

The teaching staff is involved in research and publishing papers. Analysis of the CVs and the h-indexes of the staff shows that most of the publishing is done in Lithuanian journals. The expert panel agrees that it is of a great importance that the teachers have sufficient language skills and the expert panel thinks that the staff should improve their skills in English as this is the dominating language in science. Insufficient knowledge of English decreases the international visibility of the research.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The self-evaluation report provided comprehensive information about the facilities (equipment, class rooms, library, laboratories, and computer rooms). Practical tasks and scientific works are done in specialized laboratories and study rooms of various technologies using various modern equipment and instruments. During the site visit the expert panel was given the opportunity to see some research laboratories used for this study programme. The department have invested in some new research equipment (among these some state of the art microscopes), and it is important that this work continues to be able to give the students the necessary laboratory equipment necessary for doing research. For example for molecular biology the laboratory equipment seems sufficient for teaching purposes, but for research some more advanced equipment should be available (this is also mentioned in the SER, page 22). The expert panel would also like to state that making agreements with other universities for using some of the equipment necessary for modern biological research could be a possibility.

The library offers sufficient study space in the reading rooms. There are a decent number of computers installed and Wi-Fi is available. There are a number of textbooks, journals in Lithuanian and foreign language available. During the site-visit, it was discussed that the library has only a few copies of the newest literature and the expert panel discussed this with the students. As mentioned before, the university has bought more books than what is apparent from the subject descriptions in SER (annex 3.1), and the expert panel finds this positive. The library subscribes to a number of databases, which enables researches, teachers and students to have access to the majority of the international literature of the field. The library staff seemed very competent and aware of the needs of the students. Among other things, they offer courses for student to search in databases that is of a great importance. The expert panel hopes that the new library building will be finished, as this will make the resource situation even better.

During the meetings with staff and students it was almost exclusively expressed that the facilities are well used and that the working environment is very stimulating.

The study programme includes different forms of practices, such as research practice and practice during the work with the Master's thesis. The students are able to do their practical work in their scientific research practice in various Lithuanian research institutions: research laboratories of the Nature Research Centre, other universities, national and regional parks, reservations, scientific research stations, associations as well as in the research laboratories of the

Faculty of Science and Technology of LEU (SER, page 20). There is also in place systems for assuring that the student's rights are taken care of while in practise, as agreements are signed for every student for the period of practice. The expert panel finds this system good.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The admission requirements to the study programme are well founded, and persons with a first cycle study degree in Biology can be admitted to the study programme. As the student numbers are dropping, it is important that the university tries to attract students. The expert panel finds that this could be easier if the profile of the programme was clearer as discussed above. The SER gives a good overview of the number of applicants, the competition marks of the students entering the programme as well as the priority of the study programme the students has when they apply. Such analysis is in the expert's opinion very important for the university when the competition of getting good students to the programme is harder. A Master's degree study programme with only a few students (5 entrants in 2013, SER Table 2.5.1), is not sustainable and the university should consider the possibility of making a joint degree with some other university or search some other options to overcome such situation.

The students receive support, both academic and social. Information about the study programme and changes, are given at the website as well as on announcement boards in the faculty. The students get information about their grades through the Academic Information System, and they are able to discuss this with the teaching staff. The students have the possibility for consultations with the teachers, both by meeting the teachers or through the *Moodle* system. The assessment criteria of the student's achievements formulated in agreement with the LO of the programme are given in the subject descriptions (Annex 3.1). The criteria for assessment of the master thesis are also clear. The expert panel concludes that the higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support and that the assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available.

The students have the opportunity to participate in exchange programs, such as the Erasmus exchange programme. A few students have gone for exchange during the last years. The university has performed an opinion survey among the students and the results show that only a few students are willing to go for exchange as usually they combine work with studies. The expert

panel would like to point out that it is positive that the university performs such surveys. The university should continue their work with encouraging students to go for exchange.

The student can participate in active research during their Master's thesis, as well as during the Scientific Research Practise. During the site-visit the expert panel was given the opportunity to familiarise with students work such as master thesis. The expert panel believes that the thesis work is mostly descriptive, and that the students should be encouraged to do more experimental work as part of their thesis. Another point the expert panel would like to state that it is important students write their Master's thesis as if it was going to be published when it comes to figures, reference list etc.

The professional activities of the graduates of the study programme are according to the SER expected to be self-dependent research work as well as to be teacher-researchers of higher qualifications important for schools. The last expectations will only be met if the students have teacher qualification gained at bachelors' level, as this study programme does not give any pedagogical qualification. The SER gives information about the graduates from the BA programmes, and the expert panel thereby has no information about the numbers of students entering different lines of work. If the study programme was more focused as described earlier in the report, the expert panel finds that the students with a bachelor in teacher education followed by a master's degree would be highly qualified teachers.

2.6. Programme management

The study programme of Biology is implemented by the Department of Biology at the FST of LEU. The administration of the study programme and quality assurance of the programme is implemented in different ways. Different regulations are in place (SER, page 30), and the university has a Centre for Academic Quality Assurance that was established during 2012. During the site-visit the expert panel was given more information about the Centre of Academic Quality Assurance and the current action plans of the Centre. In the opinion of the expert panel it is important that the responsibilities for the quality assurance of the study programme are clear, and this is the case for this study programme. The Study Programme Committee is involved in monitoring the study programme and implementation of changes. The study programme committee includes stakeholders, but the only member is from the Association of Lithuanian

Teachers of Biology. As the Master's degree programme is not only targeted to teacher training, the expert panel thinks that the committee should include some more members. The SER involves analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme, and actions of improvements are given. It was not quite clear from the SER, who is responsible for the implementation of the Actions of improvements given in the SER. During the discussions at the site-visit it was clear that this is the responsibility of the SER committee.

From the SER it is clear that data of the implementation of the study programme are collected and analysed at a regular basis. Four different questionnaires have been developed at the Department, and given to students, teachers, alumni and to employers to get different views about the implementation of the study programme. This feedback system is considered good by the expert panel. The expert panel finds that the results from these surveys are used for improvement of the programme.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Make the profile of the study programme more clear, and look into the possibilities of making a joint degree programme with another university or find some other ways to make the programme more sustainable.
2. Revise all the subject descriptions in order to align the subject names with the content of the subjects and the LO of the study programme and as well as the LO of the subjects assuring that the LO are correct.
3. Continue work with renewal of the infrastructure to get up to date laboratory equipment and literature.
4. Improve teacher's foreign language skills to get more publications in English.
5. Try to make the teaching more efficient. This would liberate time for the staff to do more research and publish more. It would also make the programme sustainable, which it is not now, due to low incoming student numbers
6. The university must encourage and facilitate enhancement of the academic staff activity in research and to look for possibilities to decrease their teaching load.

V. SUMMARY

The self-evaluation report and documentation that was given to the expert panel was well prepared. The self-evaluation report contains analysis and data on the areas that were going to be evaluated. The documents and infrastructure tour was a good basis for expert panels' understanding of the master degree programme in Biology.

The aims and learning outcomes of the study programme is sufficient for a study programme at the master level. However, the curriculum design does not assure that the students will reach a master degree level when finishing the master study programme, as some of the learning outcomes will only be achieved if the students choose some of the elective subjects. The staff giving the study programme meets the legal requirements. The infrastructure is sufficient for teaching, but there are some shortcomings when it comes to the laboratory equipment for doing research. The library is sufficient, but we hope that the university will get funding for the much needed new library.

The student number in the programme is very low, and the programme is thereby maybe not sustainable. Making the profile of the programme more narrow would make it easier to promote the study programme. A possibility is to make a joint programme with another university to be able to offer the students a study programme of higher quality. The university should continue their work to increase the visibility of the study programme for potential students. The internal quality assurance is good and includes a feedback system. The faculty also has staff renewal plans, which is positive. As the English language is essential for international scientific communication, and all leading publications in science are in English, we feel that all professors should speak this language sufficiently. Further internationalisation of staff and students should be encouraged, and staff should be encouraged to publish in English. The university should include several other social partners in the study programme committee, as not all the graduates will work as the teachers given that students without a teacher background is also recruited into the programme.

VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Biology* (state code – 621C10003) at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences is given positive evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	2
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	13

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader:

Prof. dr. Trine Johansen Meza

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. dr. Maris Klavins

Prof. dr. Borut Bohanec

Prof. dr. Jacques van Alphen

Prof. dr. Sigitas Podenas

Inga Kalpakovaitė

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto studijų programa *Biologija* (valstybinis kodas – 621C10003) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	2
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	13

* 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 buvo pateikta gerai parengta savianalizės suvestinė ir dokumentai. Savianalizės suvestinėje pateikta vertintinų sričių analizė ir duomenys. Dokumentai ir infrastruktūros apžiūra labai padėjo susidaryti nuomonę apie šią biologijos srities magistrantūros studijų programą.

Studijų programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai atitinka magistrantūros studijų programoms keliamus reikalavimus. Tačiau programos sandara neužtikrina, kad studentų kompetencija, baigus šią magistrantūros programą, atitiks magistro kvalifikacinį lygį, nes kai kuriuos numatomus studijų rezultatus studentai pasieks tik tuo atveju, jei studijuos tam tikrus pasirenkamuosius dalykus. Programos dėstytojai atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus. Mokymui reikalingos infrastruktūros pakanka, bet yra kai kurių trūkumų, susijusių su tyrimams atlikti reikalinga laboratorine įranga. Bibliotekos patalpos ir ištekliai yra tinkami, bet tikimės, kad universitetas gaus finansavimą taip reikalingai naujai bibliotekai.

Ši programa turi labai mažai studentų, todėl ji gali būti neilgalaikė. Susiaurinus šios studijų programos profilį, būtų lengviau ją reklamuoti. Yra galimybė sujungti šią programą su kito universiteto programa ir pasiūlyti studentams kokybiškesnę programą. Universitetas turėtų toliau

didinti šios studijų programos matomumą, kad pritrauktų studentus. Vidinė kokybės užtikrinimo sistema organizuojama gerai, naudojamosi grįžtamojo ryšio sistema. Fakultetas turi ir su darbuotojų atnaujinimu susijusių planų, ir tai yra teigiamas dalykas. Kadangi anglų kalba yra pagrindinė tarptautinio komunikavimo mokslo srityje kalba ir visos svarbiausios mokslinės publikacijos skelbiamos anglų kalba, manome, kad visi dėstytojai turėtų pakankamai gerai kalbėti angliškai. Reikėtų toliau skatinti dėstytojų ir studentų tarptautiškumą, raginti dėstytojus skelbti publikacijas anglų kalba. Universitetas turėtų į studijų programos komitetą įtraukti keletą socialinių partnerių iš kitų institucijų, nes ne visi absolventai dirbs mokyklose mokytojais, kadangi į šią programą priimami ir pedagoginio išsilavinimo neturintys studentai.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Reikėtų aiškiau nurodyti, į ką programa orientuota (profilį), ir išnagrinėti galimybę parengti jungtinę programą su kitu universitetu arba ieškoti kitų būdų, kaip šią programą padaryti tvaresnę.
2. Peržiūrėti visus studijų dalykų aprašus, siekiant dalykų pavadinimus suderinti ir su dalykų turiniu bei numatomais šios programos studijų rezultatais, ir su numatomais dalykų rezultatais, užtikrinant, kad numatomi studijų rezultatai yra tinkami.
3. Tęsti infrastruktūros atnaujinimo darbą, siekiant įsigyti modernios laboratorinės įrangos ir literatūros.
4. Tobulinti dėstytojų anglų kalbos įgūdžius, kad jie galėtų skelbti daugiau publikacijų anglų kalba.
5. Siekti, kad mokymas būtų veiksmingesnis. Tada dėstytojams liktų daugiau laiko moksliniams tyrimams ir publikavimui. Ši programa taptų tvaresnė, nes dabar ji nėra tokia dėl mažo stojančiųjų skaičiaus.
6. Universitetas turi skatinti akademinio personalo mokslo tiriamąją veiklą ir rasti būdus, kaip ją palengvinti, taip pat ieškoti galimybių mažinti dėstytojų paskaitų krūvį.

<...>
