



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

EUROPOS HUMANITARINIO UNIVERSITETO
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *ISTORIJS IR KULTŪROS PAVELDAS*
(valstybinis kodas – 621V70002)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE* (*state code –*
621V70002)

STUDY PROGRAMME
At EUROPEAN HUMANITIES UNIVERSITY

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

Evaluation Coordinator Ms Eglė Grigonytė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2015

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Istorijos ir kultūros paveldas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621V70002
Studijų sritis	Humanitariniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Paveldo studijos
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (1,5 metai)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	90 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Paveldo studijų magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	Lietuvos Respublikos švietimo ir mokslo ministro 2011 m. gruodžio 23 d. įsakymu Nr. SR-6236

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Historical and Cultural Heritage</i>
State code	621V70002
Study area	Humanities
Study field	Heritage Studies
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1,5 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	90 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Heritage Studies
Date of registration of the study programme	23 rd December 2011, under the order of the Minister of the Ministry for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania No. SR-6236

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of evaluation process.....	4
1.2. General.....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/Additional information.....	5
1.4. The Review Panel.....	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	7
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	7
2.2. Curriculum design	8
2.3. Teaching staff	9
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	9
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	10
2.6. Programme management	12
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	14
IV. SUMMARY.....	15
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	16

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of evaluation process

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2. General

The application documentation submitted by the HEI follows the outline recommended by SKVC. Along with the Self-evaluation Report and Annexes, the following additional documents have been provided by the HEI before and during the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	Recommended Literature of Master’s Study Subjects;
2.	The System of Evaluation of Academic Achievements of European Humanities University;

3.	Regulation on Internships of Students of European Humanities University.
----	--

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

The study programme *Historical and Cultural Heritage* at European Humanities University is a one-and-a-half year (full-time studies) Master programme.

The programme was accredited in April 2012 (Order No SV6-17 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education).

For the evaluation, the following documents were used:

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

The basis for the evaluation of the study programme is the Self-Evaluation Report (hereafter, referred to as the SER) prepared in 2014, its annexes and the site visit of the Review Panel to the University.

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

Attention should be paid that the Panel during one site visit evaluated two study programmes of the same field (Bachelor and Master) and some information may overlap in both of the final reports.

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 20th May 2015.

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

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

2. Prof. Christopher Whitehead

Professor of Museology, Newcastle University, United Kingdom;

3. Dr. Raquel Piqué Huerta

Lecturer at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Catalonia;

4. Dr. Povilas Blaževičius

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

5. Mr Almantas Abromaitis

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

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The aims of the programme are clearly defined and are accessible through different channels: the EHU website (www.ehu.lt), other specialized websites (e.g. AIKOS) and events in Lithuania and Belarus. The information is provided in English, Lithuanian, Russian and Belarussian, which ensures accessibility of the information to a wide public. The aim of the Programme is to train specialists in the field of Heritage. The intended learning outcomes (hereafter, ILOs) are available on the EHU website, where a clear description of the expected abilities and skills is provided.

The ILOs are organised in terms of knowledge and its application, research skills, special abilities, social skills and personal abilities. The ILOs are adequate and well defined in themselves. However, the links between ILOs and study subjects are not explained in each of the areas (e.g. personal abilities, several ILOs are set against a number of study subjects and it is unclear whether each ILO responds to all study subjects listed, or only to some). There is also insufficient detail in the presentation of how the study subjects develop each of the skills and competencies. For example, the ‘Ability to create new ideas (creativity)’ ILO is linked to ten different study subjects and the Master Thesis, but without detailing precisely how the outcome is achieved through pedagogy and assessment. It also appears from interviews conducted during the site visit that students develop valuable skills in some areas that were not accounted for in the SER (e.g. interpersonal skills, teamworking etc.).

The programme aims and intended learning outcomes are adequately based on the academic and professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market. The labour market requirements are surveyed through contact with social partners and through overall surveys of EHU graduates across all subjects, and a unique survey was undertaken in preparation for this external evaluation. However, further surveys of the destination of students for this Masters programme and an understanding of market requirements in Belarus and other parts of the world would add usefully to the University’s intelligence in this area. Further clarification with regard to the adequacy of the programme in preparing graduates for both public sector and private sector work would help to inform curriculum development.

The programme aims and intended learning outcomes are consistent with the type – university studies and the level – 2nd cycle studies, and the level of qualifications offered – Master of

Heritage Studies, and also the name of the programme, its intended learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design meets the legal requirements approved by the Ministry for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania for second-cycle study programmes¹. The number of credits for year, the total amount of credits, as well as programme structure has been designed following the Bologna Process principles. The duration of the Programme is 1.5 years (3 semesters), its length in credits is 90 ECTS, including 32 ECTS of theoretical compulsory study subjects, 18 ECTS of specialised compulsory study subjects, 10 ECTS of elective subjects and 30 ECTS of Master's research. Students take five study subjects per semester. The range of the study subjects is appropriate and there is good optionality within the programme, enabling students to gain necessary groundings and also to develop personal interests. The programme is underpinned by a clear understanding of the socio-political importance of heritage. The attitude to multilingual education and language choice is commended, but it would be beneficial to consider increasing the number of subjects delivered in, or available in, English, to develop both language competency and the international competitiveness of graduates.

The study subjects are spread evenly in the different semesters and the themes are not repetitive. The content of the subjects is consistent with the type and level of the studies. Currently, there is no specific regulation for Heritage Studies in Lithuania, but the intended learning outcomes have been designed according to the international conventions on Cultural Heritage (UNESCO and ICOMOS). The content and methods of the subjects are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. In the detailed description of each study subject (Annex 2, the SER) the contents and the methods are thorough and precise. However, as stated, the intended learning outcomes themselves do not reflect the variety of skills that students develop on the programme, and should be rectified to better reflect this. The scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure achievement of the intended learning outcomes, including general and specific subjects relevant to Heritage Studies. However, although the content of the programme largely reflects recent achievements in science, art and technologies, it could take further account of the latest critical debates in Heritage Studies, notably in 'critical heritage studies', uses of the past, difficult histories, heritage and identity etc.

¹ General Requirements of Master Degree Study Programmes.

2.3. Teaching staff

The teaching staff of the programme consists of 14 individuals. The personnel are employed according to the legal acts of Lithuania and according to EHU rules. The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes and conform to the General Requirements for Master's Degree Study Programmes. According to the information provided in the SER and Annex 3, 82% of all lecturers who deliver study subjects hold a doctoral degree, and the scientific works of no less than 60% of these lecturers correlate thematically with the subjects they teach; and no less than 20% of study subjects are taught by professors. The number of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes and provision of the programme, and this is supported by a favourable staff-student ratio, standing at 1.8 at the time of the site visit.

The Review Panel noted that EHU is making an appropriate effort to maintain and promote a stable staff base. In this context the hiring of core faculty members for five years is positive and such measures are encouraged.

The higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme. It is noted that since 2013 four academic staff members, comprising 29% of the staff base, have participated in mobility programmes. Nevertheless, increased academic mobility outside of the region is encouraged in order to develop competencies and expertise, to develop awareness of Heritage Studies debates and issues elsewhere and to refresh knowledge and skills.

Some members of the teaching team of the programme are involved in research directly related to the study programme being reviewed. However, greater encouragement and support from EHU for research related to the field of Heritage Studies is desirable. Measures to promote common research between faculty members, team research and the provision of opportunities for Master students to get involved in staff research will also contribute to the vibrancy of research culture at EHU and to the quality of teaching provision. Use of the distance learning platform for collaborative research activities may be a ready opportunity for EHU staff and students, given the university context.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The premises and learning resources are adequate, although it should be noted that a move to a new building is pending. There are sufficient lecture rooms and teaching spaces, equipped with

stationary equipment (computers, projectors and screens, and some with sound systems). Three lecture rooms have computer clusters, comprising 55 computers for students. However, spaces are insufficient for the needs of the staff, both for conducting individual research and for pedagogical/pastoral activities (tutoring/mentoring students). The campus has limited space for face-to-face meetings between lecturers and students, and only one small office shared between the lecturers.

An important part of the academic activity is based on distance education. The e-learning system is well organised and is equipped adequately. The distance-learning platform Moodle is used for both the full-time and part-time studies.

There is a recognised weakness in the SER, regarding student practical activities within the context of professional formation. One response to this is to better incorporate within the curriculum student internships at external institutions (internships are not a formal part of the programme but have been arranged for students); another is to build programme content that relates to regional level real-world issues and problems. In the Review Panel's visit the social partners and alumni (many of whom have gone on to develop relevant professional careers) expressed a willingness to engage more with the programme to ensure that the practical emphasis is improved. The possibility of formal agreements and an official advisory board or forum for social partners is a clear opportunity to exploit the good will and expertise of relevant figures. During the Review Panel's visit, the difficulties for internships in Lithuania were mentioned, due to the fact that the students do not always have a good standard of Lithuanian language. The graduates and stakeholders agree on the need for more practical internships. Student engagement with practical activities based on real-world problems and scenarios is necessary to meet the needs of the labour market.

The library is well equipped and access is good. The topics of history and tourism are well represented. The holdings in the area of Heritage Studies were appropriate, but require further development.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The studies are programmed in a combination of work in class and on-line activity. This was well described in the SER and was carefully exemplified by teaching staff during the Review Panel visit. The admission requirements are well described for both modes (full-time and part-time). The selection processes are adequate – higher education qualifications and English

language competence are used in this process. Students are accepted from the following disciplines: History, Museum Studies and Protection of Cultural Heritage; Art Studies; Culturology; Sociology; Tourism and Recreation; Economics; and Law. Enrolees who do not have 1st cycle education in the above fields undergo additional training based on an individual compensatory programme and study the distance course on history of Belarus at Bachelor's level.

Individual compensatory study programmes are designed on a bespoke basis for students whose first-cycle qualifications are in relevant fields, which represents exemplary practice. The number of students admitted meets the expectation of the planned number of places in the programme by a factor of 1.2, which demonstrates the interest of the students in this programme. The admission requirements guarantee the minimum educational level of the students. The programme privileges highly motivated students and it may be that the level of independent study and thinking that is required contributes to the drop-out rate, which was 68% (n=15/22) in the 2012-14 cycle, which was the first (the second cohort of students had not completed at the time of the site visit so no data for this was available). Ensuring that prospective students are fully aware of the requirements of the programme at a pre-admission stage would help to ameliorate this.

The organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Research activity is an important part of the programme, and students undertake research to an appropriate standard, some participating in academic conferences and/or publishing research results. Although an originality requirement for the thesis was not specified, all of the theses seen by the Review Panel showed evidence of original research. Conferences organised in the EHU are an integrated part of the process of writing the final thesis. The students present the progress of their work annually. The institution has actively participated in the Erasmus and Campus Europae exchange programmes. During the period under evaluation, two students of the programme – one from 2012 intake (of 23 students) and one from 2014 intake (of 18 students) – have taken advantage of these opportunities. There were also three incoming foreign students in 2013-14 and three in 2014-15.

The academic and social support is well described in the SER. The students can obtain grants, according to their qualifications, personal achievements and social activities: four students per annum are currently provided with financial awards, one fully covering tuition fees and three covering 50% of tuition fees. This is a commendable attempt to counter the disadvantages of

students who live in Belarus and to ameliorate the material, financial or even political difficulties that might make the study process harder.

The assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and summary details of methods of assessment are publicly available on the EHU website. It is based on an internal university standard that aims to ensure principles and uniform criteria. The assessment procedures are explained during the first lecture and are clearly described in each description of the study subjects.

The record of graduates working in the field of Historical and Cultural Heritage is a strength of the programme that could be further exploited. Since most of the students return to Belarus after their studies a deep and comprehensive relationship with the social partners of the programme should be established. A Career Centre or central point for career advice at EHU would be a useful facility to help shape students' future career planning.

2.6. Programme management

The structure of programme management and decision-making process is well established and described in the SER. The responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated. However, new internal regulations on Faculty management procedures are currently under development.

The University has developed an internal Quality Management System that involves social partners and employers, graduates, students (through anonymous surveys), the academic staff who teach on the programme, various administrative units (e.g. the Curriculum Development Committee) and the Senate and Rectorate of the University. However, as previously explored, the social partners who were convoked for the Review meeting represent a significant resource for EHU. Their advice, expertise and professional perspectives could be harnessed for the benefit of the programme, and the partners demonstrated a clear commitment to this and willingness to engage with EHU. Additionally, it should be ensured that the students are involved in the structure of the programme management and decision-making and have opportunities for input in these areas that go beyond questionnaire responses, for example through a staff-student forum.

Information and data about the programme are collected by surveys at the end of each semester, and according to the SER demonstrate high satisfaction of students and lecturers. The results of a survey undertaken specifically for this evaluation are summarised in the SER. The main complaint of full-time students is the lack of a practical component in the programme. The main

complaint of part-time students concerns communication between students and lecturers. The outcomes of internal evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme. Some actions of improvement are proposed according to survey results, for example the need for greater student participation in decision-making concerning programme development also identified in this report. However other questions (e.g. concerning the development of practical skills) are not mentioned in the actions for improvement.

In general the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient. The Review Panel noted a high drop-out rate (as quantified in section 2.5) among students of the programme, which was convincingly explained in relation to the particular situation of EHU and its students. The Panel understood that in the context of higher education provision in Belarus, the more critical and individualistic education offered at EHU and the more interactive learning style favoured may lead some students to experience a 'culture shock'. The incidence of drop-outs may be diminished by developing means to address this, particularly by clarifying in advance of admission the nature of the EHU provision and the learning responsibilities of students.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Ensure that the programme engages further with the latest critical debates in Heritage Studies at the international level.
2. Develop further incorporation of social partners' and alumni input into the programme at advisory, curriculum design and pedagogical levels.
3. Consider increasing the number of study subjects delivered in, or available in, English.
4. Develop a mechanism for student input into and involvement in the management of the programme, e.g. a staff-student forum.
5. Develop opportunities for students to engage in professional practice as part of the programme, and link this to future career planning.
6. At administrative level, provide structural support for research activity, creating the environment and means for staff to engage in Heritage Studies research collaboratively and individually, locally and internationally, for example by enabling staff mobility and encouraging staff to take up research opportunities.
7. Improve facilities, in particular staff office and tutorial accommodation and the library holdings related to Heritage Studies.
8. Address the drop-out rate with targeted initiatives to communicate the nature of teaching and learning at EHU.

IV. SUMMARY

The programme aims and intended learning outcomes are generally well articulated and communicated. The intended learning outcomes need to be reviewed to take better account of actual skills development in the programme. Further research and curriculum development relating to the suitability of teaching provision in relation to the job market would be beneficial.

Curriculum design is good and study subjects are spread evenly. More attention to the latest critical debates in Heritage Studies at the international level would improve the programme, and teaching provision in English could beneficially be increased.

The teaching staff are suitably qualified and highly committed. Structures to improve the research environment and develop staff members' research careers should be identified by EHU administration.

The facilities and learning resources are adequate, but staff working accommodation, opportunities for relevant practical work by students within the curriculum and library holdings could be improved.

The study process is well managed, as is the programme management. However, the expertise and goodwill of social partners and alumni should be cultivated and exploited for the benefit of the programme, for example in the creation of an official social partners' forum, and measures to reduce the number of drop-outs should be taken. Formal mechanisms for student involvement in programme management should be developed.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Historical and Cultural Heritage* (state code – 621V70002) at European Humanities 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	4
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	19

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

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

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

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

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

**EUROPOS HUMANITARINIO UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ
PROGRAMOS *ISTORIJOS IR KULTŪROS PAVELDAS* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS –
621V70002) 2015-09-11 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-248-2 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Europos humanitarinio universiteto studijų programa *Istorijos ir kultūros paveldas* (valstybinis kodas – 621V70002) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	4
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	19

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

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

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

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

V. SANTRAUKA

Studijų programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai iš esmės yra aiškiai suformuluoti ir viešai prieinami. Vis dėlto numatomus studijų rezultatus reikėtų peržiūrėti, kad juose kuo aiškiau atsispindėtų, kokie gebėjimai iš tikrųjų yra ugdomi šioje studijų programoje. Būtų naudinga toliau plėtoti mokslinius tyrimus ir studijų turinį, susiejant juos su atitikimu darbo rinkos poreikiams.

Programos sandara yra tinkama, studijų dalykai išdėstyti nuosekliai. Programos atžvilgiu būtų naudinga, jei daugiau dėmesio būtų skiriama naujausioms tarptautinėms kritinėms diskusijoms paveldo studijų tematika, taip pat būtų naudinga daugiau dėstyti anglų kalba.

Programos akademinis personalas yra aukštos kvalifikacijos ir labai atsidavęs darbui. Universiteto administracija turėtų sukurti sistemą, skirtą mokslo tiriamosios veiklos aplinkos gerinimui, o taip pat dėstytojų mokslinės karjeros plėtrai.

Materialieji ištekliai yra tinkami ir pakankami, tačiau būtų galima pagerinti dėstytojams skirtas patalpas, taip pat suteikti daugiau galimybių studentams atlikti tiesiogiai su studijomis susijusias praktikas bei patobulinti bibliotekos išteklius.

Studijų procesas yra gerai organizuotas, programos vadyba taip pat gera. Vis dėlto siekiant visapusiškos naudos, reikėtų pasinaudoti socialinių partnerių ir absolventų kompetencija bei geranoriškumu, pavyzdžiui, organizuojant oficialų socialinių partnerių forumą, taip pat reikėtų imtis priemonių, padėsiančių sumažinti studentų nubybrėjimo rodiklius. Reikėtų sukurti oficialų studentų dalyvavimo programos vadybos procese mechanizmą.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Užtikrinti, kad į studijų programą būtų įtraukiamos naujausios tarptautinio lygio kritinės diskusijos paveldo studijų tematika.
2. Ir toliau skatinti socialinių partnerių bei absolventų dalyvavimą programos tobulinime konsultaciniu, programos sandaros tobulinimo ir pedagoginiu lygmenimis.
3. Apsvarstyti galimybę didinti anglų kalba dėstomų arba siūlomų dėstyti studijų dalykų skaičių.
4. Sukurti studentų dalyvavimo programos vadybos procesuose mechanizmą, pvz., dėstytojų ir studentų forumą.
5. Sudaryti studentams galimybes studijų metu atlikti profesinę praktiką, susiejant ją su būsimos karjeros planavimu.
6. Administraciniu lygmeniu teikti sistemine paramą mokslo tiriamajai veiklai – akademiniam personalui sukuriant sąlygas ir priemones individualiai ar kartu, vietos ar tarptautiniu lygmeniu įsitraukti į mokslinius tyrimus kultūros paveldo srityje. Kaip pavyzdį šiuo atveju galima paminėti, dėstytojų judumo galimybių užtikrinimą ir skatinimą pasinaudoti galimybėmis atlikti mokslinius tyrimus.
7. Pagerinti materialiuosius išteklius, ypač dėstytojams skiriamas patalpas, įskaitant patalpas skirtas studentų konsultavimui, taip pat su kultūros paveldo studijomis susijusius bibliotekos išteklius.

8. Spręsti studentų nubyrejimo problema tikslingai supažindinant būsimus studentus su studijų Europos humanitariniame universitete pobūdžiu.

<...>

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