



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Europos humanitarinio universiteto
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS PASAULIO POLITIKOS IR
EKONOMIKOS STUDIJOS**
(valstybinis kodas - 612L20010)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF WORLD POLITICS AND ECONOMY STUDIES
(state code - 612L20010) STUDY PROGRAM
at European Humanities University

Experts' team:

1. **Prof. Dr. Turo Virtanen (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. Dr. Mikael Svensson,** *academic,*
3. **Prof. Dr. Benedikt Speer,** *academic,*
4. **Ms. Marta Čubajevaitė,** *social partners' representative,*
5. **Mr. Lukas Kisielius,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator –

Mrs Kristina Maldonienė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Pasaulio politikos ir ekonomikos studijos</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612L20010
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Politikos mokslai
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės studijos – 4 metai Ištęstinė, 5 metai
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Politikos mokslų bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2013-05-08 Nr. SV6-38

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>World politics and economy studies</i>
State code	612L20010
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Political Science
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full time - 4 years Part-time - 5 years
Volume of the study programme in credits	240 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor degree in Political science
Date of registration of the study programme	2013-05-08 Nr. SV6-38

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 students' performance assessment.....	10
2.6. Programme management	12
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
IV. SUMMARY	16

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 (hereafter – SER) 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 after the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1	Internship WPE (Information on students’ possibilities for internships)
2	Literature (Reading lists for courses)
3	Literature WPaE (Reading lists for courses)
4	WPE 2year courses (syllabus 2 nd year courses)
5	Course descriptors 3-4 year (22 files with course descriptors for year 3 and 4)
6	Low residence WP (Curriculum, two CVs, descriptions study courses 1 st year)

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

The European Humanities University (hereafter - EHU) was established in Minsk in 1992. In 2004 it was closed and was forced into exile. It was re-established in Lithuania in 2005. The University has the rights of a legal entity and acts in the manner prescribed by the laws and regulations of the Republic of Lithuania, the University Statutes and other legislation, incorporating the standards and guidelines of the European Higher Education Area. The University is a member of the Lithuanian National Higher Education System.

The programme on World Politics and Economics (henceforth - WPE) was introduced in 2014 and the first students were admitted for the 2015 cohort.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. 1-01-151 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 13/10/2016.

- 1. Prof. Dr. Turo Virtanen (team leader)** *University of Helsinki, Professor, Finland.*
- 2. Prof. Dr. Mikael Svensson,** *University of Gothenburg, Professor, Sweden.*
- 3. Prof. Dr. Benedikt Speer,** *Carinthia University of Applied Sciences, Professor, Austria.*
- 4. Ms. Marta Čubajevaitė,** *National Non-Governmental Development Cooperation Organisations' Platform, Lithuania.*
- 5. Mr. Lukas Kisielius,** *student of Vilnius University, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The aim of the programme is according to the SER (p. 7) to prepare highly qualified professional analysts capable to competently analyse, evaluate and publicly present social, economic and political processes in a broad context, theoretically define and explain the peculiarities of a political processes, evaluate economic situations of various countries and activities of the European Union and international organizations, as well as to independently perform research, organize and implement practical and applied projects. The definition is relatively broad and promises a lot. At the same time, there is a focus on “peculiarities” that is not explained or justified. The programme is oriented to integration of political science and economics studies. As such, the orientation is justified from the point of view of searching promising knowledge base for explaining major trends in global governance and economy, but it is not clear, whether the focus is

on world politics as an orientation of political science or world politics as a factual phenomenon approached with various frameworks.

Moreover, when the programme promises to “provide conditions for acquiring professional competences and skills in the field of political studies and economics” (SER, p. 8), the expected qualifications are probably set too high. Professional competences and skills of these two major disciplines of social sciences need considerably more credits and longer study time. When the programme specifies the learning outcomes (SER, p. 7) – knowledge and its application, ability to carry out research, special abilities, social skills and personal abilities – the connections to the aim could be stronger, although the specification of the outcome is in line with the key verbs of the aim (analyse, evaluate, conduct research, etc.). The general themes of the subjects fit well to the specified learning outcomes. However, review team did not receive all course descriptions, which made it impossible to assess closer the alignment of the intended learning outcomes of all courses with intended learning outcomes of the entire programme (see section 2.2).

The programme management is cooperating with academic, social and business partners in preparing the self-evaluations of the study programmes, but it is not clear to what extent the competences aimed at in the study programme are developed on the basis of the ideas and feedback of these partners and whether there is diversity in expectations. However, SER (p. 9) states that the needs of the labour market and competencies achieved in study programmes are followed with surveys, but as there are of yet no graduates of the WPE programme, there is no evidence from alumni. The content of the needs is specified to some extent in the context of quality management in the SER (p. 27). The programme has been compared to relevant other study programmes in Belarus’ State University to find its comparative strengths. Even market share in Belarus is estimated, but also the needs of Lithuanian labour market are addressed, although the main target is Belarus (SER, pp. 11-12). In this sense, the programme management is knowledgeable about the academic and professional requirements of its partners and competitors and has also specified some weaknesses of the programme (SER, p. 13).

The programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of Bachelor level studies and the level of qualifications offered and they are publicly available on the website of the University. Also the name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications pursued are generally compatible with each other (as described in the first chapter of SER, pp. 7-13), although the English name “World Politics and Economics” (rather than “Economy”) would maybe align better with international terminology. Aims and learning outcomes reflect sufficiently the ministerial order of the study descriptor of the field of political science as of 2015, also referred to in SER (p. 9).

2.2. Curriculum design

The EHU bachelor study programme WPE was only up for evaluation in the high-residence mode of study delivered for 4 years and containing 240 ECTS. The number of courses per semester does not exceed the maximum of 7. According to the study plan EHU sent as an additional document after the evaluation, low-residence studies are the same as high-residence by subjects EHU teach. The study programme is comprised of subjects of general university studies (16 ECTS), major subjects of Political Science studies (164 ECTS) and minor subjects of Economic Studies (60 ECTS) (SER, page 13), which does not fully meet legal act requirements, as, according to general requirements for first level study programmes, subjects of study field should consist no less than 165 ECTS.

Whereas the general learning outcomes contained in the SER seem to be consistent and, according to the study plan, the subjects spread evenly and consistently, it is not possible to evaluate whether themes of the subjects are not repetitive, as course descriptions, of which all after the first year of study were missing before and during the site visit. During the site visit it was explained that 2nd and 3rd year of high-residence students are studying in Vytautas Magnus university (hereafter – VDU) according to special EHU-VDU agreement (*for more information see 2.6. Programme management part*). Missing course descriptors (of 2nd and 3rd year of high-residence studies) were presented to review team after the site visit, but as they were prepared by VDU and are taught by VDU teachers, they cannot be evaluated as part of this particular study programme. Therefore, it was very difficult for the review team to assess if the content and methods used are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. As the study programme has only started in 2015, during the evaluation, practical experiences could also only be assessed for the 1st year of studies. Whereas the students seemed rather satisfied, it was, however, learnt from the staff that no personal contacts with their VDU-counterparts were foreseen during the 2nd and 3rd years of studies, which would be a prerequisite to ensure that subjects are not repetitive.

As stated above, only during the site visit the evaluation team learned about the existence of a low-residence version of the programme with the same title and content, but exclusively delivered by EHU, which first admitted students in September 2016. For this programme, a study plan (identical with high-residence version) could only be delivered after the evaluation, separate course descriptions were not available. Supposedly the review team should assume that the afterwards delivered course descriptions for the high-residence programme might also be taken for the low-residence programme. However, this was never clarified and the fact remains that – differing from the high-residence programme – the whole low-residence programme is delivered by EHU, so that the VDU-course descriptions are not applicable in this case. It is, therefore, not possible to evaluate this programme at all. Given all this evidence, the evaluation of the curriculum

design has highlighted many unusual practices, open questions and inconsistencies, which are not compatible with the common planning and running of a study programme.

2.3. Teaching staff

The study programme, based on the courses provided by EHU during the first year, is provided by staff meeting the legal requirements (but this is only part of the programme). At EHU, ten (10) among the 12 teachers listed as involved in the programme have a PhD; 7 professors, 2 associate professors, 1 PhD lecturer, and 2 lecturers (SER, p. 16). However, unfortunately, the evaluation group has not been provided access to all CVs for teachers in year 2 and 3 (that for high-residence students are provided by the VDU, and for low-residence programmes provided by EHU). Therefore, it is not possible to evaluate if all teachers meet legal requirements. This also implies that it is not possible to evaluate if teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes for year 2 and 3 in the programme. Therefore, for the full programme the review team cannot evaluate if the study programme, regarding teachers, satisfies the legal requirements.

Teaching staff for the first (and fourth) year of the programme have experience in the taught subjects and a background and training (PhDs) in relevant subjects. Once again, for year 2 and 3, it is not possible to evaluate given the lack of information and the review team can thus not assess if qualifications of the teaching staff in the programme are adequate to ensure learning outcomes.

The review team cannot evaluate if the number of teachers is adequate to ensure learning outcomes given the described lack of information for all four years. Considering the large number of teachers at two different universities involved in the programme it is very important for teacher co-ordination in order to ensure that the independent courses link to each other and that the content of each course is sufficiently adjusted to the prerequisite knowledge of the students. EHU and VDU needs to implement a formal strategy for co-ordination between teachers if the students will take courses at the two different universities.

Whether or not the level of teaching staff turnover is such that an adequate provision of the programme can be assured cannot be evaluated at this point given that the first cohort of students was first enrolled in 2015, and is thus only in their second year of studies.

The university provides conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff e.g. in the form of national and international projects related to the programme. Teachers have for example been visiting researchers at universities in Poland, France and the Czech Republic (SER, p. 16). But international mobility is relatively limited and strategies should focus on increasing international research co-operation for the teaching staff, e.g. in the form of increasing EU-funding partnership positions. There are also some, although limited, examples of incoming mobility

mentioned in the SER, such as invited lectures provided by researchers based in the US (SER, p. 16).

The research interests are aligned with the taught courses and cover a range of research themes (SER, p. 15 and CVs). However, the research conducted by the faculty is (almost) entirely in non-English outlets and output listed e.g. on Scopus author search reveals that the large majority of the teachers have no registered output in the Scopus indexed journals. Considering the European profile and the ambitions to be part of the European academic community this is a major weakness.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The facilities located at Valakupiu str. 5, Vilnius, used for exam sessions in the low residence studies and both for exams and face-to-face teaching in the 1st year of high-residence studies, contain a sufficient number of adequately equipped auditoriums for lectures and seminars. However, as specified in SER (p.20), there is a lack of individual working spaces for lecturers and student consultations; unoccupied classrooms or rooms of the department are used for those purposes. Access to premises is restrained for students with disabilities. During the meeting EHU administrative staff informed that in the future (though specific date is unknown), the university is planning to move to the other campus in the central parts of Vilnius. Neither the new campus nor the premises, teaching and learning facilities for the 2nd and the 3rd year high-residence students are evaluated here. Therefore, to summarize, current 1st year high-residence study programme premises are considered adequate with the recommended improvements as expressed above.

The basic literature for the study programme is located at the EHU library and/or uploaded on the respective courses' Moodle e-learning platform. Due to limited funding, library resources were not properly updated for the last two years (SER, p.20). The evaluation team visit to the library also allowed concluding that relevant study programme literature there is limited. At the level of the University there is a subscription service to several relevant full-text international databases, such as Academic Search Complete, JSTOR collections, Taylor and Francis online, all accessible in campus and most also off-campus (SER, p.19). Moreover, EHU students can supplement their learning materials by accessing literature and e-sources at the Centre for Business Education, located at EHU administrative building (Tauro str.12), also at other libraries in Vilnius (SER, p.19), especially the nearby located Scholarly Communication and Information Centre of Vilnius University. Nevertheless, though EHU seems to have managed to ensure student access to study materials despite its limited library resources (e.g. via uploads on Moodle) and only few students consulted during the study visit expressed their discontent, the evaluation team recommends the University to improve its library resources, both the books and access to full-text international databases.

As informed during the study visit, an introductory training how to use library resources is provided to all students enrolled at EHU, recently, the library also started offering more specialized courses on the usage of e-databases, etc., however, it still needs to attract a wider interest of students. During the high-residence study lectures a number of relevant computer software programmes, such as SPSS, are used; for individual self-study high-residence students can use 3 computer classes with relevant software installed (SER, p.18). Wireless Internet at EHU premises allows students to use their own computer equipment; the students can also use 7 computerised workspaces at the library or 55 computers at 3 computerized auditoriums (SER, p.18).

Moodle distance learning platform has a developed support system (SER, p.18) and seems well incorporated in the teaching and learning processes of EHU: most of the 1st year high-residence courses use Moodle, the low-residence study programme is delivered entirely through Moodle. Moodle integration to the learning process exemplifies the advanced solutions in digitalization of teaching. To conclude, teaching and learning equipment available at EHU is adequate in terms of their size and quality.

In principle, the University has adequate arrangements for students practice based learning during their internships scheduled in the last study semester; however, its implementation cannot be assessed as currently the first cohort of students are only on their 2nd year of studies. Two supervisors, one from University and one from the host institution, will guide student during his/her internship. For assessment of this practice-based course, students will be required to submit a written report and defend it at EHU. The preliminary list of student internship host institutions is adequate, nevertheless, a wider range of international stakeholder organisations and the private sector could be considered. Moreover, the preliminary duration of an internship (4 weeks full-time or 8 weeks part-time flexible time-table) is considered rather short to achieve the expected learning goals and demonstrate professional competence. Furthermore, if international internships (e.g. through Erasmus+) in other EU countries were offered to students, longer internship periods and more flexible timetable when the internship can be conducted may be required.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The admission requirements are adequate and well-founded. In 2015/2016 there were 16 candidates out of whom 15 were admitted. Of these 15 students, 4 are fully funded places, 4 partly-funded places (both 75% and 50% funded) and 3 non-funded places (SER, p.21). In 2016/2017 41 students were admitted – 16 to high residence, 25 – to low residence studies.

Organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. In the high-residence mode, 80% of classes are organized weekly in Vilnius, while the rest are carried out by lecturers who live in Belarus and work

accordingly to the prescribed agenda. The lectures held in Vilnius include several contact lectures and examination session, while the rest are carried out on distance using the help of Moodle system (SER, p.20). Students were satisfied with the features of the web-based studies. There are some instruments which let students submit their feedback about the study quality. However, during the visit, students informed that they have rather limited information about the outcomes of their study evaluation. WPE programme was only up for evaluation in the high-residence mode of study, low-residence students were admitted in 2016 autumn, thus there is no possibility to decently evaluate this criterion for low-residence studies.

Participation in research is not very popular (yet) among the students of the WPE programme. Students took part in one international conference held by EHU. In the SER it was stated that it is expected that students will be more involved in scientific research starting from their third year (SER., p.21). Given that the programme started in 2015/16 it was not possible to evaluate this statement.

There are a number of possibilities to participate in student mobility programmes. EHU participates in LLP the Erasmus and Campus Europae. Once again, it is not possible to evaluate the student participation in these programmes since the programme started in 2015/16.

The Governing Board of EHU is responsible for the financial support. Approximately 78% of high-residence Bachelor's Programme students and 18% of low-residence Bachelor's Programme students receive financial support from EHU (SER, p. 22). Approximately 26% of high-residence students do not pay for their studies. The average sum of the support for students from Belarus are 433 EUR or 49% of the established cost of studies and potential funding depend on academic results. Currently, there are 58 scholarships in the whole university, which are primarily targeted to high achieving students. At the on-site visit the EHU administration explained that more substantial support for low-residence students is under discussion. There also is EHU Emergency Fund Scholarship, which is granted to students who were earlier deprived of learning opportunities in Belarus because of political reasons. During the 2015-2016 Academic year, one student from WPE Studies was granted this scholarship (SER, p.22).

In the SER it is said that there also are a lot of possibilities to participate in various competitions in order to get some kind of financial support for students' research and creative projects. (SER, p.22). However, as of yet students have not actively participated in these projects. The university does not have its own dormitories but rents facilities from Vilnius University (SER, p.23). Nevertheless, during the interview the students stated that current situation completely fulfils their needs.

The system of assessing students' academic achievements is based on internal university standard. Procedures of academic achievement assessment include current students' marks; final

students' evaluation per academic course; final certification of graduates; analysis of students' practice performance results; rating of students; analysis of relevance and credibility of the system of assessing knowledge levels for a certain study course; assessment of subject-specific learning outcomes; assessment of general learning outcomes; evaluation of relevance and credibility of the system of assessing knowledge levels for a certain study course (SER, p.23-24). In post-visit communication EHU also stated that the same evaluation system is used for low-residence students.

Considering that the WPE programme is very new, there are no graduates yet. Hence, there is no information of job market outcomes among the graduates, as well as no possibility to measure if their professional activities meet programme providers' expectations. Students' answers about their future plans varied from state institutions in Belarus to media agencies, tutoring, working as political or international relations analyst, etc. either in Lithuania or Belarus.

2.6. Programme management

The head of the department and the Programme Curator of BA of WPE Studies are directly responsible for the implementation of the programme (SER, p. 25). There is a clear organization of dealing with the changes of the study programmes, from Chief of Academic Affairs to operational level of department meetings, where the study programme is discussed on regular basis. However, SER (p. 26) states that some new regulations regarding Faculty management are under development. The Centre for Low Residence and Distance Learning is responsible for developing and maintaining the infrastructure and pedagogical instruments for distance learning. A very informative introduction to the system and observations during the site visit indicate that the Centre has managed to create very good solutions for distance learning.

SER identifies only the responsibilities of EHU and not those of VDU, which implements the second and third academic year of the programme for the high-residence students. The allocations of responsibilities in SER can be understood to cover also the low-residence programme (launched in September 2016). The review team had no information about the practices of VDU during the review. Given the limited information, the review team concludes that the responsibilities are clearly allocated only in the implementation of the first year of the programme.

Since the SKVC's institutional review in 2009, EHU has developed new tools for quality management. The new tools, such as student surveys, student appeals, statistical information about retention, annual progress and achievement rates, etc., are used also for the quality management of the BA programme of WPE Studies (SER, p. 26). This is evidence about adopting new practices based on external evaluation in order to improve the programme. There is also clear evidence about the use of student and lecturer surveys and very informative descriptions of their results specifying the strengths and weaknesses of the programme implementation, as experienced by teachers and

students (SER pp. 27-28). However, there is not information available of the practices of quality assurance that VDU is applying for the second and third year of the programme. For distance learning, there are some additional arrangements for quality management (SER p. 26-27). The Centre works also in internal certification of distance learning courses and distance learning faculty quality control. However, SER does not specify what have been the development measures of the BA programme of WPE Studies based on the available feedback information. To some extent, this is understandable because of the programme has been in operation only slightly more than one academic year.

Stakeholders take part in programme evaluation and improvement, for example the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, School of Young Managers and Belarusian Institute of Strategic Studies. They have also specified expected competences of the graduates of the programme (SER, p. 27). SER (p. 28) specifies weaknesses of programme management: unclear management competences of the Academic Department and the hierarchical model of university bureaucracy. This implies open atmosphere and willingness to improve programme management.

In conclusion, information about implementation of the programme is collected and analysed, but so far this covers only the first year of studies, because the programme is new. This may also explain why there is lack of evidence about using the results of internal evaluations already done. It is understandable that at the time of site visit and SKVC review there is no evaluative information about the studies of high-residence students during the second and third academic year to be implemented by VDU. Internal quality assurance system of EHU is clearly operating and is efficient in collecting and analysing information about the BA programme in question. The system's effectiveness remains limited, because the high-residence programme has operated only one academic year and low-residence programme was launched only on autumn 2016. However, the SER shows a plan for improvement after each chapter, which indicates willingness to use the evaluative information.

As noted in this report, some major problems emerged slightly before and during the site visit. Part of the course descriptions turned out to be missing. When requested, the answer was that there were only course descriptions for the first academic year. The explanation given was that because the programme is a joint programme with VDU and when the students study the second and third academic year there, the course descriptions do not exist. However, after the site visit some additional (but not all) course descriptions were sent to SKVC and the evaluation team. Further, as described, it also turned out that EHU was running a low residence version of the same programme, starting in autumn semester 2016. This programme is to be taught by EHU alone. Course descriptions for the low residence programme did not exist either (but for the first year). Moreover, according to SER (pp. 11 and 13), students studying in the high residence programme

will receive two diplomas, one from EHU and one from VDU. After the site visit the review team was informed by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania that it is only possible to award two diplomas from two different HEIs (if studying one programme) when the programme is registered as a joint study programme. And as described, the WPE programme is not a joint study programme between the EHU and VDU, but rather there only exists a cooperation contract between EHU and VDU, three parties agreement on partial studies between VDU, EHU and student.

Furthermore, even if the content of both study programmes (at EHU and VDU) was matched, that would allow transfer without any limitations, the Regulations of Transfer Studies (Order of the Ministry of Education and Science No ISAK-1603) regulates student exchanges, but does not regulate mutual studies of several HEIs. The review team was also informed that the matching content of the study programmes between EHU and VDU must be carefully demonstrated in substantially more detail than the current statement provided by EHU.

Given the situation, the students of the programme may have unjustified expectations about receiving two diplomas. All in all, it seems that the programme management has not certified the legal nature of the programme together with relevant authorities adequately, and the study process remains largely open, although students have already been admitted both for high residence programme (one year ago) and low residence programme (in autumn 2016). The review team concludes that the quality assurance measures of the University and the programme management related to launching the programme have failed.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The programme should reconsider the formulation of aims and learning outcomes and content of curriculum to ensure that the expectations of prospective students are realistic as for academic and professional competences of political science and economics to be achieved by graduation from the programme.
2. EHU and VDU should continue their collaboration and establish a joint BA programme of World Politics and Economy and ensure the compliance with legal regulation of the programme together with relevant authorities. At the same time, the possible differences of the responsibilities between the implementation of the high residence programme and low residence programme should be addressed and the responsibilities allocated to EHU and VDU respectively, should there be two versions of the same programme.
3. The quality assurance system of VDU should be linked to the quality assurance of the programme, because VDU implements the second and third academic year of the programme for the high-residence students.
4. The University or Faculty should increase incentives and introduce strategy to promote international research publications. This may be achieved by directly linking career opportunities to international publication in indexed journals.
5. Library resources (available books, access to full-text international databases) should be improved.
6. The programme should review preliminary internship arrangements (duration, timetable, internship placements) which could help facilitate the internationalization of internships and wider stakeholder outreach.

IV. SUMMARY

The programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent and adequate for a bachelor level programme. Also the name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications pursued are generally compatible with each other. However, the review team did not receive all course descriptions, which made it impossible to fully assess the alignment of the intended learning outcomes of all courses with intended learning outcomes of the entire programme.

During the site visit the review team learned that the high-residence programme, offered in collaboration with VDU, is also complemented by a low-residence programme offered and taught solely by EHU. Hence, as for the curriculum, it is not possible to evaluate whether themes of the subjects are not repetitive, as course descriptions, of which all after the first year of study were missing before and during the site visit. During the site visit it was explained that 2nd and 3rd year of high-residence students are studying in VDU according to special EHU-VDU agreement. Missing course descriptors (of 2nd and 3rd year of high-residence studies) were presented to the review team after the site visit, but they were prepared by VDU and are taught by VDU teachers. For the low-residence programme, a study plan (identical with high-residence version) was delivered after the evaluation, but separate course descriptions were not available. It is, therefore, not possible to evaluate the low-residence WPE programme.

Based on the courses provided by EHU during the first year, the WPE programme is provided by staff meeting the legal requirements. However, unfortunately, the review team has not been provided access to all CVs for teachers in year 2 and 3. Therefore, it is not possible to evaluate if all teachers meet legal requirements. This also implies that it is not possible to evaluate if teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes for year 2 and 3 in the programme.

The facilities at Valakupiu str. 5, Vilnius, used for exam sessions in the low-residence studies and both for exams and face-to-face teaching in the 1st year of high-residence studies, contain a sufficient number of adequately equipped auditoriums for lectures and seminars. However, there is a lack of individual working spaces for lecturers and student consultations. The university is planning a move to new facilities in the central parts of Vilnius, which may imply better facilities.

The admission requirements are adequate and well-founded. Organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. Considering that the WPE programme is very new, there are no graduates yet. Hence, there is no information of job market outcomes among the graduates, as well as no possibility to measure if their professional activities meet programme providers' expectations.

Considering that year 2 and 3 in the high-residence programme is taught by VDU, the review team should have been provided the material also for these years. Considering the lack of

such material and the limited information, the review team concludes that the responsibilities are clearly allocated only in the implementation of the first year of the programme. As documented in this report, some major problems emerged slightly before and during the site visit. It seems that the programme management has not certified the legal nature of the programme together with relevant authorities adequately, and the study process remains largely open, although students have already been admitted both for high residence programme (one year ago) and low residence programme (in autumn 2016). The review team was informed that it is only possible to award two diplomas from two different HEIs (if studying one programme) when the programme is registered as a joint study programme. Further, the review team was informed that if EHU and VDU does not intend to establish a joint study programme (and thus only offer one diploma) it is necessary that the matching content of the study programmes between EHU and VDU must be carefully demonstrated in substantially more detail than the current statement provided by EHU.

The review team concludes that the quality assurance measures of the University and the programme management related to launching the programme have failed.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *World politics and economy studies* (state code – 612L20010) at European Humanities University is given **negative** 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	1
3.	Teaching staff	1
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	1
	Total:	11

*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:	Turo Virtanen
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Mikael Svensson
	Benedikt Speer
	Marta Čubajevaitė
	Lukas Kisielius