



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *EKOLOGIJA IR APLINKOS*
VALDYMAS (valstybinis kodas - 612C90001)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT OF
ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (state code –
612C90001) STUDY PROGRAMME
at KLAIPĖDA UNIVERSITY

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

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Ekologija ir aplinkos valdymas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612C90001
Studijų sritis	Biomedicinos mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Gyvybės mokslai
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Gyvybės mokslų bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1997 gegužės 19, Nr. 565

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Ecology and Environmental Management</i>
State code	612C90001
Study area	Biomedical sciences
Study field	Life Sciences
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First cycle
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Life Sciences
Date of registration of the study programme	19 May 1997, No 565

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process.....	4
1.2. General.....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information.....	5
1.4. The Review Team.....	6
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	6
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	6
2.2. Curriculum design	8
2.3. Teaching staff	9
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	11
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	12
2.6. Programme management	13
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
IV. SUMMARY	16
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	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 prepared by Higher Education Institution (hereafter - HEI)*; 2) *visit of the review team at the higher education institution*; 3) *production of the evaluation report by the review team and its publication*; 4) *follow-up activities*.

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

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

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

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

1.2. *General*

The Application documentation submitted by the HEI follows the outline recommended by the SKVC. Along with the self-evaluation report and annexes, the following additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	H-indexes of the staff teaching in the programme (table) (EN)
2.	Qualification requirements for teaching staff positions set by Klaipeda university (LT)
3.	Regulations on the performance assessment of the pedagogical and research staff, and on the order of organising open competitions at Klaipeda university (LT)

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

The study programme *Ecology and Environmental Management* (first cycle) is given at the Klaipeda University (KU). After completion of the programme, the graduates are granted a Bachelor's degree in Life Sciences (before 2010 it was Bachelor's degree in Ecology and Environmental Studies, thus in Self – Evaluation Report it is still named as Ecology and Environmental Studies). The study programme is given in the Department of Ecology in the Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics at KU. The faculty consists of four departments: Department of Biology and Ecology, Department of Geophysical Sciences, Department of Informatics and Department of Mathematics and Statistics. Other faculties such as Faculty of Humanities, Faculty of Social Sciences, Faculty of Marine Engineering are responsible for the subjects in general university and fundamental science (e.g. physics, chemistry) education given as part of this study programme. The study subjects of general university education as well as general education are taught on the university scale for students of all specialities. The Academic Affairs Office coordinates the different University divisions that are involved in the programme.

The study programme is clearly providing the students with a broad general education and targeted, career-specific education in Ecology and Environmental Studies that is of importance in the Lithuanian trade market. The students that have completed the programme also have a possibility to continue their academic career by taking a master degree either at KU or other universities in Lithuania or abroad.

The study programme in the field of studies of Life Sciences (before Ecology and Environmental Sciences) was evaluated in 2008 and given unconditional accreditation.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was composed according to the *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No 1-55 of 19 March 2007 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education, as amended on 11 November 2011. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 9th October 2014.

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

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The main aim of the programme and its learning outcomes are well described in the Self – Evaluation Report (SER). The programme aims and learning outcomes, in general, are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of the qualifications offered. The aim of the programme (SER, pg. 8) is to prepare qualified specialists of life sciences. The programme is designed to reflect the needs of the labour market. The graduates will be granted a Bachelors degree that they may use to enter a Master degree programme if they wish to continue their academic career. The programme and its aims are communicated to potential students via practice classes and lectures provided by the staff, via brochures and website of the University. The expert panel thereby concludes that the learning outcomes are publicly available.

The programme targets high demands of well-educated specialists in the field of ecology and environmental management for the national labour market. Bachelors in Ecology and Environmental Management are in demand at different governmental bodies of the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture, research organisations, coastal industry and private companies acting in the field of nature resource exploitation, green technologies and renewable resources, as well as in non-governmental environmental organisations. Because complete higher education cycle involves a Master of Sciences degree, studies could be continued in the Master programmes of ecology, ecology and environmental sciences, ecological or environmental engineering and further lead to the entrance of graduates in PhD programmes of biomedical and agricultural sciences. Graduates of the programme and stakeholders ensured the evaluation team that there is a need for graduates of this programme in the labour market. A large part of the graduates are working in the positions where they are using skills developed during the studies. Social partners take active position at the renewal of the study programme content and are involved in the study process during practice classes. They are offering placement positions to students of the study programme as well as topics for graduation thesis.

Content of learning outcomes of the programme largely assures that the graduates will acquire most of the competences necessary for being professional in Ecology and Environmental Management. Bachelor of Life Sciences programme sufficiently prepares students, either to continue their studies or find a position directly after graduation. Practical training at the laboratories of the University or Institutes and placements in enterprises support the implementation of learning outcomes.

The programme has been externally evaluated in 2008. Major changes in the programme were implemented following the advice of the external evaluation committee. The name of the programme was changed from “Ecology and Environmental Studies” to “Ecology and Environmental Management” starting from 2014. Thus Self – Evaluation Report, which was submitted on February 6, 2014, deals with programme named “Ecology and Environmental Studies”, when at the moment of evaluation programme is titled “Ecology and Environmental Management”. The change of the programme better fulfils requirements of the labour market in Lithuania. Changes in the programme are implemented following the advises of the external evaluation committee and are in agreement with social partners as well as all students, that started their studies in the programme with an “old” title.

2.2. Curriculum design

The bachelor study programme has been prepared according to the existing regulations and requirements for the University undergraduate study programmes in Lithuania, as the duration of the study programme is four years, with a volume of 30 ECTS per semester. The content of the studies corresponds to legal acts concerning number of subjects per semester, study volume expressed in credit points as well as structure and approaches of examinations. The curriculum design is in accordance with the Bologna requirements.

Study subjects are almost equally divided between the eight semesters. The proportion of theoretical subjects, term projects, practical tasks and graduation papers are largely appropriate, their themes aren't repetitive. Students did not report any problems with the work-load. A variety of electives can be chosen by the students, this provides the programme with more flexibility for student needs according to their background and orientations, however for such small number of students it is questionable whether they really have the opportunity for choosing the desired subjects.

The content of the subjects is consistent with the level of the studies, but we would also encourage the staff to use more recent English textbooks for further improvement.

We acknowledge, that proportion of courses in mathematics and statistics are in good shape, but graduates expressed desire and we would recommend taking into account, that aims of these courses could be easier achieved by using hands-on ecological examples on how to use models and statistics in ecology. During the site-visit, the graduates informed the expert panel, that since the mathematics and statistics courses are given prior to their own experimental work, the students do not always see the connection with these courses and what they are going to use the knowledge for. Due to this fact, the expert panel suggest using hands-on ecological examples which would improve the already well-functioning courses.

In general, the content of the subjects is appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, but in some cases, judging the literature sources used for the teaching process, courses not fully cover the scope of the subject. Such shortcomings were noticed for the following courses: Ecological Monitoring and Pollution Control; Training Practice on Zoology of Invertebrates; Marine Organisms and Artificial Ecosystems; Animal Ecology; Introduction to Ecology. Students also expressed wishes, that level of some courses should be raised. The feedback mechanisms, the supervision and quality assurance of practical work outside the University needs to be addressed.

The scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes.

The content of the programme reflects the latest achievements in science and technologies to a certain degree; however we acknowledge that it is practically impossible to involve the latest achievements instantly in the BSc programme, but we also wish to indicate, that newest textbooks, recent scientific publications and open access to scientific databases could make that transition much easier.

2.3. Teaching staff

Teaching staff of the programme meets the legal requirements and expectations. From the other side, in the Summaries of Study Subjects (Annex P2) teachers listed for separate subjects in some cases aren't the same as listed in the Annex P3 (Academic staff of the programme in Ecology and Environmental studies) for the same subjects.

Turnover in the teaching staff is acquired by recruiting PhD's trained in the same department. In addition to this, social partners are largely alumni of the same University. This creates a society of mutual admiration that becomes blind for weaknesses in the programme and prevents further quality improvements. Staff should preferably be recruited also from other universities. The quality of study programme would benefit from this. We remind, that when a competition is staged for a position of a professor, an external member, i.e. an International Expert, shall be included in the Commission. During the site-visit talking to administration and teachers, the expert panel found that "Open" positions mean that they are open for a particular person and nobody from outside has a chance to get the position. All teachers go through re-evaluation process every five years. If somebody showed better results, higher position is opened, but if somebody is not fulfilling minimal requirements, a lower position is announced. In this way, unproductive staff will be able to stay in the department until retirement. This means that young specialists (even young specialists with doctor's diploma) are not having a chance to get a position, and from the other side we see old unproductive persons, staying in the same position forever. From the documentation, the expert panel found that there are at least three teacher in the programme not having a doctoral degree, and in additional there are staff that are teaching in field that are not their main field (for example, there are a teacher with a doctoral degree in science teaching law).

The University and teachers make a lot of effort to ensure high pedagogic quality of the teaching, but still the qualifications of the teaching staff are unbalanced.

As the quality of the teachers also depends on their scientific productivity, the management should actively try to make more time available for research. As a consequence of the high

teaching load and other duties at the Departments, possibilities of teachers to do high-standard scientific research are limited. Most of the teaching staff of the programme are active in research directly related to the study programme, but that does not apply for the whole teaching staff. Some of them aren't active in research, or are teaching few unrelated subjects.

A brief test of the publication performance using *h*-index indicated poor results for a large percentage of teaching staff. The staff should not be content with fulfilling the minimum requirements for scientific publications, but should strive for excellence.

Such situation is well visible for students, because teachers from the University departments are getting lower evaluations on average in student's surveys, than teaching staff from research units and from outside the University. That was also pinpointed during meetings with students and alumni.

Increasing number of technicians directly helping teachers in the study process, especially in practical tasks, could facilitate some free time for teaching staff.

There is also a concern about the insufficient knowledge and skills of English among part of teaching staff, what was also pointed out by students. This is clearly problematic, since English is the dominant language in science. This hampers the international visibility of the research and staff, and prevents further internationalisation. More efforts should be made that teachers are using possibilities for exchange, especially for the younger teachers that have a relatively low frequency of visits abroad. The staff should also be encouraged to attend international conferences abroad. The expert panel acknowledges that the part-time teachers are using the mobility possibilities through the research institutes rather than the University. The expert panel does however like to point out that it is of importance that the teachers raise their teaching competence in addition to their research competence and find that Erasmus exchange should be a possibility. We find that exchange of part-time teachers are better than for full-time teachers, and believe that the exchange of full-time teachers should be encouraged.

Given the low number of students the number of teaching staff is high. This allows small group teaching and one to one teaching. According to the students, the teachers from the University are easily accessible, but sometimes it is more complicated to reach teachers having part-time positions and coming from the other institutions. The lack of direct contacts is partially compensated because they can share information in Moodle or directly by e-mail, students can get consultations before exams.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The quality of premises for studies and student research satisfy the basic needs to provide good quality education. Great efforts were taken to improve the facilities during the recent years. During the meetings with staff and students, it was expressed, that the facilities are well used and that the working environment is very stimulating.

The SER provided comprehensive information about the facilities (equipment, class rooms, library, laboratories, and computer rooms). Practical tasks and scientific works are done in specialized laboratories and study rooms of various technologies using various modern equipment and instruments. The newly built laboratory building is available for the programme as well as up-to date teaching technologies. Further renovation of classrooms and laboratories is under way. During the site visit the expert panel was given the opportunity to see the teaching laboratories used for this study programme, and we conclude that the laboratories are equipped in a sufficient manner for the students to get the knowledge and skills necessary for a study programme in the first cycle.

The Department has no special field station for student's practice. That lack is partially covered by the close cooperation with social partners, when using their resources and possibilities. It should be noted, that in the study process, possibilities to do field courses, in particular to do BSc thesis work in the field conditions, are of great importance. Social partners and students take active part in improving the study programme, especially situation with learning facilities for their practical training.

There are adequate number of textbooks and practice/laboratory manuals for most of the study courses in the study programme and measures are taken to purchase the most important titles for the remaining courses. Most problems occur only for courses that are taught by teachers, that aren't active researchers, as listed in p. 2.3. *Teaching staff*. The library facilities and availability of electronic resources are of high quality. There is access to major data bases and they are used by students for their research. Easy access to the Web of Sciences would improve the situation further. Learning materials in general are accessible; e-learning materials and e-resources are available and used by the students. Although teachers and students have comparatively good access to the newest literature, but not all the teachers are using the opportunities. Listed Titles in some courses (e.g. *Ecological monitoring and pollution control*, *Vascular plants* and others) do not cover the whole subject or are outdated.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The admission requirements to the study programme are well founded, and the students enter the study programme after applying through the centralised Lithuanian system. The entrant's admission marks consists of marks in biology, chemistry and mathematics as well as the Lithuanian language and literature. A problem in respect to student admission is the small number of students that enter the programme. The department should become more active in advertising the programme to potential students.

The programme schedule is rational; it includes lecturing, laboratory training, field works and placements. Lectures and classroom activities are distributed evenly as possible and sufficient time for self-education is set as well.

The spectrum of topics of the BSc-theses is rather broad, but still many of them are purely descriptive and do not address clearly formulated hypotheses. The marks given for these topics are also variable. We noticed, that, in general, theses directed by advanced researchers are in better shape, than theses directed by supervisors not active in scientific research.

Students in their free time can participate in other activities, like sports, art, dance and alike.

Students are informed about international exchange possibilities, but the outgoing student number (= 1 per year with increase to 4 in 2012-2013) could be higher than it is now. During the interviews with students, we found out that sometimes it is difficult for students to use exchange programs like ERASMUS as they have to catch up after they have returned. This is strictly against the idea behind ERASMUS and should be changed.

Students receive necessary academic support, advising in respect to study programme content. They are provided with consultations about career opportunities during special events organized by administration.

The teaching process includes a variety of methods and there is a satisfactory interaction between students and teaching staff for consulting and communication. Students are involved in committees and other working groups and have the opportunity to express their ideas.

Basic social support seems to be accessible and students are aware about possibilities to obtain social support. They have possibility to live in dormitories, and to get grants and scholarships.

The study result registration system is well elaborated and clear for students. Student performance assessment includes diverse assessment tools, their impact on the total scoring is balanced and the assessment criteria are available. The thesis assessment procedure is regulated, transparent and accessible both to students and evaluation committee.

A conflict resolution mechanism exists and students are aware of their rights. No complaints were found during the site visit.

The students interviewed stated, that they are well informed about the evaluation criteria, the exam times, but there is lack of information about relation between subjects and the learning outcomes. The number of drop outs in the last years is rather low (0 – 1 case yearly).

A part of the students is planning to continue studies at MSc level, but not necessary at the same University. There was a sudden decrease in number of graduates which continue their studies in MSc programs (25 percent in 2013). The graduates leaving the study programme with BSc are mostly looking for positions in the national labour market, however ecologists needed in the labour market seems to be relatively low, judging the employment of the graduates.

2.6. Programme management

Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated, but not always effective. From the discussions during the site-visit, it seems, that most of the decisions, if not all, are made by the administration and teaching staff is not effectively involved in the improvement of the programme. That happens mostly because most of the teaching staff is coming from the other institutions and are concentrated only on their courses or just part of the course they are teaching. The low attractiveness of the programme is of major concern. A thorough analysis of the causes is urgent. The efficiency of marketing and promoting the programme has to be improved since without recruiting more students the programme is unsustainable. Further sources for funding for students need to be explored. The profile of the programme must be sharpened. Klaipeda University is most advanced among Lithuanian universities in Marine Ecology and that needs to be more advertised when promoting the programme for potential students.

The internal quality assurance measures taken aren't always effective and efficient. Information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected after each semester and analysed, but decisions made are not always effective. For example, graduates pointed out, that they were regularly asking for more practical courses related to speciality subjects, but changes in programme were not adequate to their needs.

Students also expressed opinion, that courses, which get lower markings during their surveys, not always were substantially improved. Student and graduate feedback should be used more extensively in the future and should have more visible impact on the programme.

The contact to the stakeholders is often based on personal contact between the University teachers and representatives of industry or governmental bodies and stakeholders are often graduates from the programme. We advise the management to have also more independent stakeholders that are graduates from other universities.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue the work of making the study programme more visible for potential students. The profile of the programme must be sharpened. The most valuable sides of the programme must be more advertised, potential students should be better informed about advantages of the programme graduates in the labour market.
2. Whole teaching staff must be effectively involved in the improvement of the programme, also more attention should be paid to the opinion of students and graduates.
3. Implementation of improvement measures must be more precisely monitored, must be achieved, that internal quality assurance measures would be effective and efficient.
4. Active measures must be taken by the University administration to improve quality of teaching staff.
5. Open positions should be more widely advertised and not adapted for particular person, ensuring, that applicants will be graduates from different universities, not only graduates from the same Klaipeda University.
6. Try to make the teaching more efficient. This would liberate time for the staff to do more research and publish more. It would also make the programme sustainable, which is not now, due to low incoming student numbers.
7. The staff should strive to publish more and to publish more often in English in journals covered by the science citation index.
8. Improve the skills in active and passive English of the staff. All staff members should have a reasonable command of the English language.
9. More attention should be paid to the textbooks, databases and other sources of information that are used for the teaching, more recent English textbooks should be used during the studies.
10. We advise the management to have also more independent stakeholders that are graduates from other universities.

V. SUMMARY

The aims and learning outcomes of the study programme are sufficient for a study programme at the Bachelors level. The programme reflects the needs of the labor market in Lithuania, learning outcomes are publicly available. Social partners, that are offering placement positions to graduates, are taking active position at the renewal of the programme content. Major changes in the programme were implemented following the advice of the external evaluation committee in 2008. The name of the programme was changed from “Ecology and Environmental Studies” to “Ecology and Environmental Management” starting from 2014.

The programme has been prepared according to the existing regulations and requirements for the University undergraduate study programmes in Lithuania. The curriculum design is in accordance with the Bologna requirements. The scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes, the content of the subjects is consistent with the level of the studies, but we noticed, that some courses do not cover full scope of the subject. Study subjects are almost equally divided between the eight semesters and variety of electives can be chosen by the students, however it is questionable whether they really have the opportunity for choosing the desired subjects.

Teaching staff of the programme meets the legal requirements and expectations, but the turnover in the teaching staff mostly is acquired by recruiting graduates of same department. In addition to this, social partners are largely alumni of the same University. That often prevents further quality improvements. The number of teaching staff is high in relationship to low number of students entering the programme. The University and teachers make a lot of effort to ensure high pedagogic quality of the teaching, but still the qualifications of the teaching staff are unbalanced, part of the teachers aren't active in research, or are teaching few unrelated subjects. In general, teaching staff from research units and from outside the University are getting better evaluations from students and graduates. The insufficient knowledge and skills of English among part of teaching staff is evident, probably because of that, not all of them are using international exchange possibilities and not attending scientific conferences abroad.

Great efforts were taken to improve the facilities during the recent years. It is evident, that the working environment is very stimulating. The library facilities and availability of electronic

resources are of high quality. Learning materials in general are accessible and used by the students. The Department has no special field station for student's practice, which is of great importance for teaching process. That lack is partially covered by the close cooperation with social partners.

The admission requirements to the study programme are well founded, but still a major problem for the sustainability of the programme is the drop in numbers of entering students. The programme schedule is rational, lectures and classroom activities are distributed evenly and sufficient time for self-education is set as well. The teaching process includes a variety of methods and there is a satisfactory interaction between students and teaching staff for consulting and communication. The study result evaluation and registration system is well elaborated and is clear for students. A conflict resolution mechanism exists and students are aware of their rights.

The spectrum of topics of the BSc-theses is rather broad, but, in general, theses directed by advanced researchers are in better shape, than theses directed by supervisors not active in scientific research.

Students are informed about international exchange possibilities, but the number of outgoing students could be higher than it is now. One of the reasons is that they have to catch up after they have returned.

Basic social support is accessible and students are aware about possibilities.

Students also can participate in other activities, like sports, art, dance and alike in their free time at the University.

The low attractiveness of the programme is of major concern, as it creates a great risk for the sustainability of the study programme because of the drop in student numbers entering the programme. The staff should continue working with increasing the visibility of the programme for potential students.

Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated at the university, but teaching staff is not effectively involved in the improvement of the programme and the internal quality assurance measures taken aren't always effective and efficient. Student and graduate feedback should be used more extensively in the future and should have more visible impact on the programme. More independent stakeholders that are graduates from other universities should be involved in the improvement of the programme.

VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Ecology and Environmental Management* (state code – 612C90001) at Klaipėda University is given positive evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

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

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. dr. Maris Klavins

Prof. dr. Borut Bohanec

Prof. dr. Jacques van Alphen

Prof. dr. Sigitas Podėnas

Inga Kalpakovaite

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Ekologija ir aplinkos valdymas* (valstybinis kodas – 612C90001) vertinama **teigiamai**.

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

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Studijų programos *Ekologija ir aplinkos valdymas* tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai atitinka bakalauro studijų programoms keliamus reikalavimus. Programa atspindi Lietuvos darbo rinkos poreikius, numatomi studijų rezultatai viešai skelbiami. Socialiniai partneriai, kurie suteikia absolventams praktikos vietas, aktyviai dalyvauja programos turinio atnaujinime. Atsižvelgiant į išorinio vertinimo grupės 2008 m. pateiktas rekomendacijas, buvo atlikti svarbūs programos pakeitimai. Nuo 2014 m. programos pavadinimas *Ekologija ir aplinkotyra* pakeistas pavadinimu *Ekologija ir aplinkos valdymas*.

Ši studijų programa parengta vadovaujantis Lietuvoje galiojančiais teisės aktais ir universitetinėms pirmosios pakopos studijų programoms taikomais reikalavimais. Programos sandara atitinka Bolonijos proceso dokumentų reikalavimus. Programos apimtis yra pakankama, norint pasiekti numatomus studijų rezultatus, dalykų turinys atitinka studijų pakopą, tačiau, reikia pažymėti, kad ne visi studijų dalykai apima visas to dalyko temas. Studijų dalykai beveik vienodai paskirstyti aštuoniems semestrams, ir studentai gali rinktis įvairius laisvai pasirenkamus dalykus, tačiau kyla abejonių, ar jie iš tikrųjų turi galimybę rinktis pageidaujamus dalykus.

Šios programos dėstytojai atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus ir (studentų) lūkesčius, bet keičiantis dėstytojams į jų vietą daugiausiai priimami tos pačios katedros absolventai. Be to, socialiniai partneriai dažniausiai yra to paties universiteto alumnai. Tai dažnai trukdo toliau gerinti (programos) kokybę. Atsižvelgiant į tai, kad stojančiųjų į šią programą skaičius nedidelis, dėstytojų yra daug. Universitetas ir dėstytojai deda daug pastangų, kad užtikrintų aukštą pedagoginę mokymo kokybę, vis dėlto dėstytojų kvalifikacijos yra nesubalansuotos, tam tikra dėstytojų dalis nėra aktyviai įsitraukusi į mokslinius tyrimus ar dėsto vos kelis nesusijusius dalykus. Apskritai studentai ir absolventai geriau vertina dėstytojus iš mokslo institutų arba ne iš šio universiteto. Akivaizdu, kad tam tikros dėstytojų dalies anglų kalbos žinios ir įgūdžiai yra nepakankami, ir galbūt dėl to ne visi dėstytojai pasinaudoja galimybe dalyvauti tarptautinių mainų programose bei nesilanko užsienyje vykstančiose mokslinėse konferencijose.

Pastaraisiais metais buvo dedama daug pastangų gerinti infrastuktūrą. Akivaizdu, kad sukurta labai skatinanti darbo aplinka. Bibliotekos patalpos ir elektroninių išteklių prieinamumas yra aukštos kokybės. Metodinė medžiaga iš esmės yra prieinama, ir studentai ja naudojami. Katedra neturi specialios studentų praktikai skirtos lauko tyrimų bazės, kuri yra svarbi studijų procesui. Šį trūkumą iš dalies sumažina glaudus bendradarbiavimas su socialiniais partneriais.

Priėmimo į studijų programą reikalavimai yra pagrįsti, tačiau dėl stojančiųjų skaičiaus mažėjimo kyla pavojus programos tvarumui. Programos tvarkaraštis yra racionalus, paskaitos ir darbas auditorijose paskirstytas lygiai, o savarankiškam mokymuisi taip pat skirta pakankamai laiko. Studijų procese taikomi įvairūs metodai, studentų ir dėstytojų bendravimas konsultavimosi ir informacijos perdavimo tikslais yra patenkinamas. Studijų rezultatų vertinimo ir registravimo sistema yra gerai parengta ir studentams suprantama. Sukurtas konfliktų sprendimo mechanizmas, studentai žino savo teises.

Bakalauro baigiamųjų darbų temų spektras yra gana platus, bet apskritai baigiamieji darbai, kuriems vadovauja tyrėjai, yra geresnės būklės nei tie, kurių vadovai nėra aktyvūs mokslinių tyrimų srityje. Studentams pranešama apie tarptautinių mainų galimybes, bet išvykstančių studentų skaičius galėtų būti didesnis. Viena iš priežasčių yra ta, kad grįžę jie turi pasivyti kitus studentus.

Pagrindinė socialinė pagalba yra prieinama, studentai žino šias galimybes.

Laisvalaikio studentai turi galimybes dalyvauti ir kitoje universiteto veikloje, pavyzdžiui, sporto, meno, šokių.

Labiausiai nerimą kelia mažas programos patrauklumas; dėl stojančiųjų skaičiaus mažėjimo kyla didelis pavojus studijų programos tvarumui. Programos vykdytojai turėtų toliau didinti programos matomumą, kad pritrauktų studentus.

Atsakomybė už sprendimus ir programos įgyvendinimo stebėseną universitete aiškiai paskirstyta, bet dėstytojai nėra veiksmingai įtraukti į programos tobulinimo procesą ir ne visos vidinio kokybės užtikrinimo priemonės yra veiksmingos. Ateityje reikėtų plačiau panaudoti iš studentų ir absolventų gaunamą grįžtamąjį ryšį ir didinti jo poveikį programai. Į programos tobulinimo procesą reikėtų įtraukti daugiau nepriklausomų socialinių dalininkų, kurie yra kitų universitetų absolventai.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Imtis tolesnių veiksmų, siekiant padaryti programą labiau matomą galimiems studentams. Būtina paryškinti programos profilį, daugiau reklamuoti vertingiausius šios programos aspektus, geriau informuoti potencialius studentus apie programos absolventų privalumus rinkoje.
2. Visi dėstytojai turi veiksmingai prisidėti prie programos tobulinimo, be to, daugiau dėmesio reikėtų skirti studentų ir absolventų nuomonėms.
3. Tobulinimo (gerinimo) priemonių įgyvendinimas turi būti griežčiau kontroliuojamas; būtina siekti, kad vidinio kokybės užtikrinimo priemonės būtų veiksmingos.
4. Universiteto administracija privalo imtis veiksmingų priemonių, skirtų dėstytojų kvalifikacijai tobulinti.
5. Reikėtų plačiau reklamuoti laisvas darbo vietas (o ne pritaikyti pareigas konkrečiam asmeniui), užtikrinant, kad kandidatai bus įvairių universitetų, o ne tik to paties Klaipėdos universiteto absolventai.
6. Stengtis, kad mokymas būtų veiksmingesnis. Tada dėstytojams liktų daugiau laiko moksliniams tyrimams ir publikavimui. Ši programa taptų tvaresnė, nes dabar ji tokia nėra dėl mažo stojančiųjų skaičiaus.
7. Dėstytojai turėtų stengtis skelbti daugiau publikacijų, ypač anglų kalba, aukštą citavimo indeksą turinčiuose žurnaluose.
8. Gerinti akademinio personalo gebėjimus aktyviai ir pasyviai vartoti anglų kalbą. Visi dėstytojai turėtų pakankamai įvaldyti anglų kalbą.

9. Daugiau dėmesio reikėtų skirti vadovėliams, duomenų bazėms ir kitiems mokymui naudojamiems informacijos šaltiniams, studijų procese reikėtų naudoti naujesnius vadovėlius anglų kalba.
10. Į programos vadybą patariame įtraukti daugiau nepriklausomų socialinių dalininkų, kurie yra kitų universitetų absolventai.

<...>
