



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

EUROPOS HUMANITARINIO UNIVERSITETO
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *KULTŪROS PAVELDAS* (*valstybinis
kodas – 612V70001*)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF CULTURAL HERITAGE (*state code – 612V70001*)
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>Kultūros paveldas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612V70001
Studijų sritis	Humanitariniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Paveldo studijos
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4 metai), iššęstinė (5 metai)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Paveldo studijų bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	Lietuvos Respublikos švietimo ir mokslo ministro 2012 m. balandžio 18 d. įsakymu Nr. SR-2018

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Cultural Heritage</i>
State code	612V70001
Study area	Humanities
Study field	Heritage Studies
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 of Heritage Studies
Date of registration of the study programme	18 th April 2012, under the order of the Minister of the Ministry for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania No SR-2018

© 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	10
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	11
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	12
2.6. Programme management	13
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	16
IV. SUMMARY.....	17
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	18

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.	The System of Evaluation of Academic Achievements of European Humanities University;
2.	Regulation on Internships of Students of European Humanities University;
3.	Recommended Literature of Bachelor’s Study Subjects;

4.	Prospective Outline of the Programme's Study Plan.
----	--

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

The study programme *Cultural Heritage* at European Humanities University is a four-year (full-time studies), five-year (part-time studies) Bachelor 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 the First Degree and Integrated 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, 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 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 on 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 20/05/2015.

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: European Humanities University (hereafter, EHU) website (www.ehu.lt) and other specialized websites (e.g. AIKOS). Information is provided in English, Lithuanian, Russian and Belarusian languages, which ensures accessibility to a wide public. The university also develops other promotional material and participates in study related exhibitions. The aim of the programme is to train specialists in the field of heritage, with an important focus on the field of tourism. The intended learning outcomes are available on the EHU website as well, where a description of the expected abilities and skills of students is provided.

The intended learning outcomes are divided in groups: knowledge and its application; research skills; special abilities; social skills; and personal abilities. The intended learning outcomes are adequate and, in general terms, well defined. However the intended learning outcomes and their links with the study subjects are described in a too generic manner. The intended learning outcomes are summarized in the table 1 of the SER, but only a list of the intended learning outcomes and a list of study subjects is provided; the study subjects are not connected to the specific intended learning outcomes. Though in Annex 2 of the SER a more detailed information of the study subjects is provided, the relation between them and the intended learning outcomes listed in table 1 of the SER is unclear (also it should be mentioned that the intended learning outcomes described in Annex 2, does not fully match with the intended learning outcomes listed in table 1).

The areas of professional activity for which specialists are trained are related to heritage and tourism. However the intended learning outcomes are focused mainly towards the professional requirements in the field of Tourism: travel companies, tour-guides, guide-interpreters, developers of travel routes, experts in tourism activities. There are many specialized subjects which respond to the professional requirements of this particular field, covering a wide spectrum of topics: *Tourism and Recreation Potential, Tour Guiding, Development of Cultural Heritage for Tourism, Tourism Economics, Tourism Management, Tourism Marketing, Advertising and PR in Tourism, Tour Operating, Marketing in Cultural Sphere, Culture Projects Management, New Media for Tourism Communication, Web Design and Internet Marketing in Tourism, Tourism Terminology in English, Tourism Terminology in French/German*. The internship is also oriented to the Tourism field (Tourism and Recreation Internship).

Regarding the intended learning outcomes oriented to the field of Heritage, the programme is unbalanced – not just an emphasis is on Tourism field, but also the programme devotes a smaller number of study subjects to cover the intended learning outcomes related to Heritage studies (mainly knowledge and skills in Heritage field are developed in the study subjects: *Introduction of the Theory of Cultural Heritage, Fundamentals of Museum Studies, Interpretation of Cultural Heritage, Museum in Cultural Context, Immovable Historical and Cultural Heritage: Theories, Use and Development.*) The Review Panel considers that the intended learning outcomes necessary for both fields – Tourism and Heritage – are rather different, which makes it desirable to increase the offer of study subjects in Heritage. The staff at EHU are planning to offer a new specialisation in Heritage Studies in order to solve this situation. A prospective outline of the programme's study plan was provided during the site visit at EHU.

The programme aims and intended learning outcomes are consistent with the type – university studies – and level – 1st cycle studies and to some extent (issues with the full orientation to Heritage field) with the qualification offered – Bachelor of Heritage Studies.

The title of the programme *Cultural Heritage* does not fully reflect the contents and the intended learning outcomes. The weight on Tourism field is quite significant. Although the programme was formed containing 5 different specialisations, at the present time only the specialisation of *Tourism* is offered to the students. The Review Panel considered that the title of the programme should better reflect the contents of the programme, by incorporating the term *Tourism*.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design meets the legal requirements approved by the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania¹. The number of credits per year, the total amount of credits, as well as programme structure has been designed following the Bologna Process principles. The programme comprises 180 ECTS of the study field subjects (legal requirement – at least 165 ECTS), 60 ECTS study subjects of general university studies (legal requirement – at least 15 ECTS). The ECTS for practice activity are 15 (legal requirement – not less than 15 ECTS) and the final thesis occupies 12 ECTS (legal requirement – not less than 12 ECTS).

The study subjects are spread evenly in the different semesters (8 semesters for the full-time studies, 10 semesters for the part-time studies) and the themes are not repetitive. In the full-time studies the first semester is devoted to the compulsory study subjects of general university

¹ General Requirements of First Degree and Integrated Study Programmes

studies, the remaining subjects in general university studies are spread in the semesters II, III, IV, V, and VI. The subjects of the study field (Heritage and Tourism) are taught from the semester I, and are spread over all semesters. From the semester IV the specialisation subjects (*Tourism*) are offered. In the part-time studies the study subjects of general university studies are spread between the semesters I to VI; the subjects of the study field (Heritage and Tourism) are distributed during all the semesters and the subjects of the specialisation (*Tourism*) are offered from the semester IV.

The content of the subjects is consistent with the type and level of the studies. Currently there are no specific regulations for the Heritage Studies in Lithuania, but the intended learning outcomes have been designed according to the international conventions on Cultural Heritage (UNESCO and ICOMOS). However, some shortcomings are detected regarding the scope of the topics offered in the study subjects. Regarding the subjects of the study field, *Art History* is covered in depth in comparison with other areas: Heritage, Archaeology, History, Literature or Anthropology. Additionally, the geographical focus in subjects of study is predominantly the Belarus area; world or European perspectives on the regional area are underrepresented.

The scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes in the field of Tourism. However, the scope of the programme is not sufficient enough for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes in other fields of Cultural Heritage (detailed information is provided in section 2.1.). There is no possibility for the moment to follow any of the other four specialisations of the programme (*History of Belarus, Religion Studies, Anthropology; Cross-cultural Communication, Art Criticism and Art Management*). The supervisors of the programme are seeking to improve the curriculum, suggesting 60 ECTS devoted to a deeper specialization in Heritage Studies. The plans of the EHU to offer this new specialization in Heritage Studies can solve in part the problem of lack of competences in this field. However, the students who will not choose this specialisation will be awarded with Bachelor of Heritage Studies degree as well. The Review Panel considers it necessary to improve the main part of the curriculum regarding Heritage Studies, not merely to offer a new specialisation.

The content of the programme reflects the latest achievements regarding the theoretical and methodological approaches to the topic of Cultural Tourism and to some extent Heritage Studies, as well as relevant applied technologies.

2.3. Teaching staff

The teaching staff of the programme consists of 27 individuals. The personnel are employed according to the legal acts of Lithuania and the rules of EHU.

Officially the qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. According to information provided in the SER, 51.85% of the lecturers have scientific degree (PhD). The other members of teaching staff have qualifications at Master's level. According to the legal requirements, at least 50% of the subjects in the study field should be taught by scientists; the programme fulfils this requirement, as 50,6% of the study field subjects are taught by PhD lecturers.

The number of teaching staff is adequate to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. According to information provided in the SER, the ratio of students per lecturer is 7.1 (192 students, 27 lecturers 2014/2015), which is quite low. This ratio helps to ensure a high quality studies.

The staff turnover appears to be low, most of the teaching staff having full-time allocations.

The higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff. The institution organises e-learning seminars which are necessary for the provision of the programme, especially considering that the part-time mode requires distance learning, and in the full-time studies is also used e-learning methodology of studies.

The number of non-PhD lecturers is high, also a low percentage of lecturers are involved in research or professional activities in the field of the specialisation offered (*Tourism*). Despite the fact that the programme accomplishes the legal requirement with the number of PhD lecturers, the Review Panel believes that it is desirable to take measures to achieve a higher number of lecturers with PhD. This situation makes it necessary for the higher education institution to create conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff in relation to research and subject-area expertise relevant to the programme, beyond pedagogical skills. The measure proposed by the institution is adequate – encourage mobility to other countries to improve pedagogical and scientific qualifications, and increasing of the number of full-time lecturers in recent years. However, as stated it is desirable to increase the number of lecturers with PhD degree.

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. Also, some of them (6) have been working on e-learning methodologies (the most useful for the part-time studies) and academic projects. According to information provided in Annexes 4, 5 and 6 only one lecturer has experience in leading research projects on Tourism, the main field of the specialisation of the degree. It should be noted that just five lecturers of the programme have demonstrable experience (papers, work experience) on topics related to the field of Tourism. Information provided in the SER does not fully demonstrate that the qualifications of all teaching staff are fully adequate to ensure the full achievement of the intended learning outcomes related with Tourism. Measures for increasing the research activity in the field of Tourism and Cultural Heritage should be instituted.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The premises and learning resources are adequate. Lecture rooms are equipped with multimedia, computers and projectors, which allows the use of new technologies for teaching. The size of the lecture rooms is adequate for the number of programme students and lecturers. EHU premises are adequately equipped with the Internet access and the students have access to 55 computers in different auditoriums.

However the spaces are insufficient for the needs of the staff, both for research and academic activities (tutoring/mentoring students). The campus has limited space for face-to-face meetings between lecturers and students, and only one small office is shared between the lecturers. However the University has plans to move into new premises, which may solve the space problems of the institution.

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

There is insufficient information in the SER regarding student internships at external institutions. However, the participation of students in the University life as lecturers' assistants and coordinators of student activities is well described. During the Review Panel's visit to EHU the difficulties of students 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 social partners

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 admission requirements are well described for both modes. The selection processes are adequate: the overall average marks of secondary qualifications (indicated in the diploma) and marks of specific disciplines ("Foreign Language", "Civics/Human. Society. State", "World History/National History" "Russian Language", "Russian Literature", and, if studied "Second Foreign Language"; "Belarussian Language" and "Belarussian Literature"). Exams and interviews are also used in this process. Only enrolees with average mark higher than 6 can participate in the competitive selection. The number of students admitted meets the expectation of the planned number of places in the programme, which demonstrates the interest of students in this programme. The number of students admitted to full-time study was 31.3 on average during the last three academic years (the expected number of students admitted was 30). In part-time studies the number of students admitted was 56 on average (the expected number of students admitted was 60). The admission requirements guarantee the minimum educational level of the students.

The organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The studies are implemented both at distance (part-time) and classroom (full-time) mode (5 or 4 years respectively). The distance learning method is used by both modes. Some of the lecturers live in Belarus and they use the Moodle platform for supporting seminars in the case of full-time studies. In the case of part-time studies the totality of the studies is organised by using e-learning methodology. The particularities of EHU, oriented to Belarussian students but located in Lithuania, and the distance mode, leads to some difficulties regarding the communication between students and lecturers, especially in the case of part-time students. Instituting measures to improve this communication is one of the actions proposed in the SER.

Students are encouraged to participate in research activities; a significant number of third-year students have presented their research in conferences (7 in 2013, 9 in 2014). Students also can apply for research grants; two of them obtained funding to carry out their research in 2012/2013.

The institution has actively participated in the Erasmus and Campus Europae exchange programmes. The percentages of incoming and outgoing students are well balanced. During evaluation period nine students went to other higher education institutions abroad and ten students came on exchange from other institutions.

The academic and social support is well described in the SER. Students can obtain grants according to their qualifications: 77% of the full-time students are provided with financial support (26% of students have fully funded places and 51% are partly funded); 42% of part-time students obtained also part-funded places.

The assessment system of students' performance is clear and adequate. It is based on an internal university standard that aims to adhere to uniform principles and criteria. The assessment procedures are explained during the first lecture and are clearly described in each description of the study subject.

There is no data of on graduates' careers since the programme was introduced in 2012. Nevertheless some data in the SER is provided regarding the previous programme (replaced by the present one). According to this information, the professional activities of the graduates meet the programme providers' expectations: 14% of the graduates enrolled in the second cycle studies, 7% started their own business and others had jobs in the field of Heritage or Tourism. During the visit at EHU the graduates expressed their satisfaction with the studies and the career opportunities offered by the programme.

2.6. Programme management

The structure of programme management and decision-making process is well 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 and it is difficult to assess the result of those changes.

The University has developed an internal Quality Management System which involves social partners and employers, graduates, students (through anonymous surveys), the Academic Department and the Senate of the University. 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 and according to the SER, demonstrate high satisfaction of students and lecturers (a summary of the results of these surveys is given). The main complaint of the full-time students is related to the practical component in the programme (the programme offers 15 ECTS of practice), which they consider insufficient for practical work in Tourism, suggesting that it is necessary to undertake more practical internships in Lithuania (limited because the linguistic competency) and abroad. Part-time students made the same complaint, but also mention problems of communication between students and lecturers (due to technical Internet problems at Belarus and the timetable of lectures).

Social partners and employers are involved in the evaluation and improvement of the programme processes. In general they are satisfied with the concept and aims of the programme, but claim that the practical skills that students develop are insufficient. During the visit at EHU the stakeholders demonstrated great interest in participating at the process of improvement of the programme. Some employers are involved in the internship of the students and have good knowledge of student's skills. From the point of view of the Review Panel, the diversity of social partners and employers and their implication with the programme is a strength and it is desirable reinforce their role in the process of improvement of the programme.

The outcomes of internal evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme. EHU conducts anonymous student surveys at the end of every semester. External surveys of employers and stakeholders were conducted during the preparation of the SER. Some actions for improvement have been proposed in the SER; however some of the concerns expressed by students and stakeholders (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 among students of the programme (around 20% during the first year in full-time studies and between 85-95% in part-time studies), 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 'cultural 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. Incorporate the term *Tourism* into the title of the programme.
2. Increase the offer of study subjects in Heritage Studies.
3. Include a regional perspective of the topics offered in the study subjects (most of the students manifested their interest in working abroad or in Lithuania, so a wide regional perspective can improve their career prospects).
4. Increase the number of lecturers with PhD qualifications.
5. Promote the research activity of academic staff in the field of Tourism and Cultural Heritage.
6. At administrative level, provide structural support for research activity, creating the environment and means for staff to engage in Tourism and Cultural Heritage 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. Develop more opportunities for students to engage in professional practice in Lithuania and abroad.
9. Develop further incorporation of social partners and alumni input into the programme at advisory, curriculum design and pedagogical levels.
10. Address the drop-out rate with targeted initiatives to communicate the nature of teaching and learning at EHU.
11. Develop a mechanism for student input into and involvement in the management of the programme, e.g. a staff-student forum.

IV. SUMMARY

The programme aims and intended learning outcomes are well defined and accessible through different channels. The intended learning outcomes and their links with the programme study subjects are described in a too generic manner. The programme aims and intended learning outcomes are based mainly on the needs of Tourism labour market; however the field of Heritage Studies needs further development. The Review Panel considered that the title of the programme should better reflect the scope of the programme, by incorporating the term *Tourism*.

Curriculum design is good and study subjects are spread evenly. The contents of the subjects are consistent with the type and level of the studies and the methods are appropriate. More attention to the world or European perspectives on the regional area would improve the programme. The scope of the programme is insufficient for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes in other than Tourism fields of Cultural Heritage.

The teaching staff are suitably qualified and highly committed. The ratio of students per lecturer is low and ensures a high quality studies. 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. Admission requirements are well described and are adequate. The organisation of both study modes (part-time and full-time) ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The programme encourages the participation of students in research activities and in the mobility programmes at international level. Academic and social support is well described, financial support is offered according to qualifications of students. Students' assessment system is adequate and clearly described.

The programme management structures seem to be well designed and are described in the SER. Surveys involving students, lecturers, stakeholders and employers are used to assess the study programme and to propose measures for improvement. 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. Measures to reduce the number of drop-outs, especially in part-time studies, should be taken.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Cultural Heritage* (state code – 612V70001) 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	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	4
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	16

*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 PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ
PROGRAMOS *KULTŪROS PAVELDAS* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612V70001) 2015-09-
11 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-248-1 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Europos humanitarinio universiteto studijų programa *Kultūros paveldas* (valstybinis kodas – 612V70001) 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	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	4
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	16

* 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 yra aiškiai apibrėžti ir viešai prieinami. Vis dėlto numatomi studijų rezultatai ir jų sąsajos su studijų dalykais yra pernelyg bendro pobūdžio. Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai iš esmės yra pagrįsti turizmo darbo rinkos poreikiais, tačiau paveldo studijų kryptiai nėra skiriama pakankamai dėmesio. Ekspertų grupės manymu, programos pavadinimas turėtų labiau atspindėti programos apimtį, įtraukiant į jį žodį „turizmas“.

Programos sandara yra tinkama, studijų dalykai išdėstyti nuosekliai. Dalykų turinys atitinka studijų rūšį ir pakopą, studijų metodai yra tinkamai pasirinkti. Prie programos tobulinimo prisidėtų didesnė orientacija į pasaulio ir Europos perspektyvas regione. Programos apimtis yra nepakankama numatomų studijų rezultatų, išskyrus susijusius su viena iš kultūros paveldo sričių – turizmu, pasiekimui.

Programos akademinis personalas yra kvalifikuotas ir labai atsidavęs darbui. Vienam dėstytojui tenkantis studentų skaičius yra itin nedidelis, o tai užtikrina kokybiškas studijas. Universiteto administracija turėtų nustatyti sistemas, prisidendančias prie mokslinių tyrimų aplinkos gerinimo ir dėstytojų mokslinės karjeros plėtros.

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. Priėmimo į studijas reikalavimai yra aiškiai nustatyti ir tinkami. Studijų eiga abiejose formose (ištęstinės ir nuolatinės studijos) užtikrina tinkamą programos vykdymą ir numatomų studijų rezultatų pasiekimą. Šios studijų programos studentai skatinami dalyvauti mokslo tiriamojame veikloje ir judumo programose tarptautiniu lygiu. Akademinės ir socialinės paramos teikimo sistema yra aiški, finansinė parama suteikiama atsižvelgiant į studentų studijų rezultatus. Studentų vertinimo sistema yra tinkama ir aiški.

Programos vadybos sistema yra tinkama; ji aprašyta savianalizės suvestinėje. Studijų programos įvertinimui ir jos tobulinimui naudojami studentų, dėstytojų, socialinių partnerių ir darbdavių apklausomis. Vis dėlto siekiant visapusės naudos, reikėtų pasinaudoti socialinių partnerių ir absolventų kompetencija bei geranoriškumu, pavyzdžiui, organizuojant oficialų socialinių partnerių forumą. Taip pat reikėtų imtis priemonių, padėsiančių sumažinti studentų, ypač ištęstinių studijų, nubyvėjimo rodiklius.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Į studijų programos pavadinimą įtraukti žodį „turizmas“.
2. Į studijų programą įtraukti daugiau su paveldu susijusių studijų dalykų.
3. Studijų dalykų temas susieti su regionine perspektyva (daugelis studentų išreiškė norą dirbti užsienyje arba Lietuvoje, taigi platesnė regioninė perspektyva prisidėtų prie jų karjeros galimybių didinimo).
4. Priimti daugiau daktaro laipsnį įgijusių dėstytojų.
5. Skatinti akademinio personalo mokslo tiriamąją veiklą turizmo ir kultūros paveldo srityje.
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 turizmo ir 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. Sukurti studentams daugiau galimybių atlikti profesinę praktiką Lietuvoje ir užsienyje.
9. Tęsti socialinių partnerių ir absolventų įtraukimą į studijų programą konsultaciniu, programos sandaros tobulinimo ir pedagoginiu lygmenimis.
10. Spręsti studentų nubyrežimo problemą tikslingai supažindinant būsimus studentus su studijų Europos humanitariniame universitete pobūdžiu.
11. Sukurti studentų įtraukimo į studijų programos vadybą mechanizmą, pvz., dėstytojų ir studentų forumą.

<...>

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