



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Šiaulių universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS "EKONOMIKA"
(valstybinis kodas – 6121JX062 (612L10006))
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF "ECONOMICS"
(state code – 6121JX062 (612L10006))
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Siauliai University

Review' team:

1. **Prof. dr. Stephan Schöning (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. dr. Jakub Brdulak,** *academic,*
3. **Prof. dr. Ramon Ramon-Muñoz,** *academic,*
4. **Mr Tautvydas Marciulaitis,** *representative of social partners'*
5. **Mr Ignas Gaižiūnas,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator -

Ms Aleksandra Tomaševskaja

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Ekonomika</i>
Valstybinis kodas	6121JX062 (612L10006)
Studijų krypčių grupė	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Ekonomika
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (3,5 metai), iššęstinė (5 metai)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	210 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Ekonomikos bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	No. 1-01-26, 15-03-2011

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Economics</i>
State code	6121JX062 (612L10006)
Group of study field	Social Sciences
Study field	Economics
Type of the study programme	University Studies
Study cycle	First cycle
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (3.5 years), part-time (5 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	210 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Economics
Date of registration of the study programme	No. 1-01-26, 15 th March, 2011

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process	4
1.2. General	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information	5
1.4. The Review Team	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	6
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	6
2.2. Curriculum design	8
2.3. Teaching staff	10
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	13
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment	15
2.6. Programme management	18
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	20
IV. SUMMARY	22
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	24

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

The evaluation of on-going study programmes is based on the **Methodology for evaluation of Higher Education study programmes**, approved by Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereafter – SKVC).

The evaluation is intended to help higher education institutions to constantly improve their study programmes and to inform the public about the quality of studies.

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: 1) *self-evaluation and self-evaluation report (hereafter – SER) prepared by Higher Education Institution (hereafter – HEI); 2) visit of the review team at the higher education institution; 3) production of the evaluation report by the review team and its publication; 4) follow-up activities.*

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

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

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

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

1.2. General

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

No.	Name of the document
1	Statistics on periodicals for students of Economics field.
2	Statistics on books, open resources and databases for students of Economics field, usage reports.
3	ISI and SCOPUS publications of teaching staff.
4	Information on installed software.
5	Student enrolment rates for the programme.

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

Šiauliai University (hereafter ŠU) was established was established 1997 as an institution of higher education of the Republic of Lithuania. ŠU delivers higher education study programmes in all three cycles, formal and non-formal programmes for qualification development and re-qualifying. It performs scientific research in the areas of the Humanities, Social, Physical, Technological, Biomedical Sciences and Arts. ŠU also has 2 institutes (Research Institute comprising 5 centres; Continuing Studies Institute). ŠU publishes 9 scientific journals; one of them is included into the Clarivate Analytics data basis.

ŠU has approximately 2.000 students and 300 members of academic staff. It is the only university in the northern Lithuania region. ŠU has over 130 agreements with foreign HEIs from 40 countries all over the world. ŠU successfully participates in various activities of ERASMUS+ programmes: exchange of students and lecturers, ECTS adjustment, intensive programmes and European networks.

Delivery of the second cycle study programme Financial and Investment Economics (hereinafter referred to as the Programme) is ensured by the Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (hereinafter referred to as the Faculty), before optimisation of the ŠU structure it was the Faculty of Social Sciences. SU registered this programme on 19-05-1997, and its last evaluation was held in 2011. This programme has been accredited for 6 years.

In comments to this report, some additional new information was provided, yet the evaluation has to be carried out only with the information provided during the visit, therefore the review team chose to dismiss some of the comments.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. V-41 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 23th of October, 2017.

1. **Prof. dr. Stephan Schöning (team leader)**, *Professor of Business Administration and Finance at SRH University of Applied Sciences, Heidelberg, Campus Calw.*
2. **Prof. dr. Jakub Brdulak**, *Associate Professor SGH Warsaw School of Economics, Poland.*
3. **Prof. dr. Ramon Ramon-Muñoz**, *Associate Professor at the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Barcelona.*
4. **Mr Tautvydas Marčiulaitis**, *Baltics Private Banking Wealth Management, Danske Bank, Lithuania.*
5. **Mr Ignas Gaižiūnas**, *student of Vilnius University study programme Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The aims and the learning outcomes of the BA in Economics are in general satisfactory. In their current state, they are clear and well-defined. Nevertheless, the evidence provided in the SER (e.g. p. 7, paragraph 17) and the information collected during the onsite meetings suggest that this BA programme has been progressively oriented towards business administration, which is not completely clearly reflected in the aims and the learning outcomes of the Programme. The same could be said regarding to what, according to the ŠU, should be one of the main characteristics of these studies. Namely to educate specialists to meet the needs of the regional economy, and through this “to promote the progress of the region and the country” (Šiauliai University Strategy, 2015-2020, http://www.su.lt/images/Universitetas/Dokumentai/D1_SIAULIAI_UNIVERSITY_STRATEGY.pdf). Therefore, the experts consider that the business orientation of the Programme should be emphasized in defining aims and learning outcomes. They also suggest that the connection and contribution of this Programme to the regional economy should be more deeply analysed and, as a result, explicitly considered in the programme aims and learning outcomes. This, in addition, will help to better match the BA in *Economics* with the mission, operational objectives and/or strategy of the ŠU. Finally, the experts would also like to note that emphasising the links of this Programme with the needs of the regional economy is not in contradiction with the fostering of internationalization initiatives such as the international mobility of students and Faculty members. The experts would welcome more efforts to promote internationalisation, a recommendation that was already made in the previous evaluation of this Programme.

The learning outcomes of the study programme (SER, Annex 7, Table 2), are consistent with the legal requirements of the Descriptor of the study field of Economics. They consist of five categories: (1) Knowledge and its application, (2) Research skills, (3) Special abilities (named Subject-Specific Skills in the SER), (4) Social abilities and (5) Personal abilities. Together with the Programme aims, learning outcomes also correspond, in general, to the type and cycle of studies as well as the level of qualifications. Nevertheless, the onset meetings with the teaching staff showed some difficulties to fully achieve the intended learning outcomes of the Programme, particularly at subject level. The experts suggest revising the latter and, when necessary, applying the required modifications to assure a full achievement of learning outcomes.

The aims and the learning outcomes of the Programme are publicly announced through several websites. Nevertheless, the experts have not always found a full equivalence between the information provided in the SER and the contents appearing in other sources, such as the English versions of the website of the Department of Economics of the ŠU (http://www.su.lt/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=11464&Itemid=2291&lang=en) and, most importantly, the website of the AIKOS Open System of Information (https://www.aikos.smm.lt/en/Study/layouts/15/Asw.Aikos.RegisterSearch/ObjectFormResult.aspx?o=LO&f=MokGalEn&key=727_2017&pt=of&ctx_sr=NGkQxEZ2UKW7pbzkvRJh%2bdg86Hc%3d). The experts suggest the homogenisation of contents in the different sources of information in which the aims and the learning outcomes of the Programme are presented and described.

The programme objectives and the intended learning outcomes are partly linked to the academic and professional requirements and to the state, societal and labour market needs. The analysis carried out in the SER (pp. 6-7, paragraphs 14-17) and the evidence collected during the onset meeting with stakeholders' representatives would provide some support to the connection between the Programme and the needs of the economy of the region. There is also evidence that confirms the involvement of stakeholders in the Programme. For example, the SER explains that specific demands from the stakeholders were met in 2015 and, as a result, learning outcomes were oriented to both the education of economists "*specialists of broad profile*" and to develop further analytical and practical skills (SER, pp. 8-9, paragraph 25). Additionally, the SER also shows high rates of employability for graduates (SER, p. 28, paragraph 155), which was also confirmed during the onsite meetings. On the other hand, the available evidence on students' enrolment shows that the total number of students in full-time and part-time studies has been declining between the academic years of 2012-13 and 2014-15 (from 614 to 192) and again between 2014-15 and 2016-17 (from 192 to 95) (SER, Annex, Table 7). Moreover, in this current academic year the enrolment of new students has been below the legal requirements and, therefore, no first year courses are offered in the BA of *Economics*. All this evidence might be understood as a mismatching between supply (Programme aims and intended learning outcomes) and demand (labour market requirements) in the region and, perhaps, at national level. Moreover, during the meeting with undergraduate students it was hypothesised that there is the believe among a large percentage of potential bachelor students in the region that study programmes in economics from other Lithuanian universities were able to provide better job opportunities than those carried out by ŠU. During the meeting with stakeholders, no clear distinction were made between graduates in the BA programme of *Economics* and those graduated in the BA programme of *Business Administration*, which is also issued by the ŠU.

Finally, during the meeting with graduate students it was claimed that further emphasis in foreign languages, as well as in regional analysis, would have been very useful in the formation of graduate students. Therefore, the experts suggest revising the aims and the learning outcomes of the programme to clearly show how the BA in *Economics* contributes to the needs and promotion of the regional economy.

The name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are partly compatible with each other and well-tuned with some (remarkable) deviations. The experts have found similarities between the orientation of this Programme and other programmes issued at the ŠU, such as the BA in *Economics and Sustainable Business* programme, which is also organised by the Department of Economics and delivered in English, and, to a lesser extent, the BA in *Business Administration*, which is organised by the Department of Management. Consequently, the experts suggest a reconsideration of the place of the BA in *Economics* in this Higher Education Institution. More particularly, the review team recommends modifying the name of the programme from *Economics* to *Business Administration* or *Business Economics* to make more compatible the contents of the programme with its real orientation. Of course, this opens the question of whether or not the current BA programmes in *Economics*, on the one hand, and in *Business Administration*, on the other hand, should be merged in a single programme. A merging process might find justification owing to the constant decline in the number of students as well as the lack of a clear segregation between economists and business administrators in the labour market of the region, as will be considered again below in section 2.5.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design meets legal requirements. Volume of study programme is exactly equal to the minimum required 210 ECTS with 15 ECTS belonging to the general university education subjects and 195 ECTS to the subjects of study field. The electives comprise 25 ECTS, practice 15 ECTS and final thesis 15 ECTS, all corresponding to the requirements. However, only a part of the practice (12 ECTS) consists of an internship, whereas the rest is simulation activity. The number of subjects (each 4-6 ECTS) per semester both in the full-time and part-time mode is below the maximum allowed 7.

Study subjects are spread evenly; their themes are mostly not repetitive. Within the full-time study mode, the volume of studies is 30 ECTS for all semesters having 5-6 study subjects per semesters 1 – 6 and 4 during the 7th semester. The workload for students is 107-160 h per subject (800 h per semester). In the 6th semester (part-time: 8th) students choose one elective out of three (*Finance and Banking, Accounting, Logistics Economics*) which are continued in the 7th semester

(part-time 10th). During the meeting with the SER Committee the experts were informed that the students had to agree on one elective and therefore had no individual choice. The students also stated that there is no need for accounting in university. The experts recommend rethinking the system of electives once again, since the number of students is steadily declining.

The contents of subjects are clearly defined and have in most cases the contents reflected in their title. A bit confusing, because quite vague, are the titles *Standard Lithuanian for Specific Purposes* and *English for Specific Purposes*. It should be considered to change these titles (e.g. to *Business English*). Additionally, the titles differ between Annex 1 Table 1 and Annex 2.

The contents of the programme and subjects suggest that the proportion of possible repetitive material is low. However, according to the course description there is a slight overlapping in *Introduction to Economic Studies* and *IT in Economics and Management*. The course *Transport Economics* is delivered after more advanced logistic courses. This sequence of courses-topics means that there exists either major repetition of the material of this course or there are serious problems with the contents of the earlier subject *Logistic*.

Mostly, the content of the subjects is consistent with the type and level of the studies. The contents of subjects are clearly described in the syllabus. The proportion of subjects related directly to *Economics* and *Business Administration* is significant, and, on the level, that is consistent with the type and level of the programme. However, at the beginning of the programme only a small part of the subjects is related to the main study field and thus students do not get an early insight into this. Another problem arises from changing the main focus of the programme away from *Economics* towards *Business Administration*. A clear indicator for this is the elimination of economic oriented electives, which were a reaction to stakeholders' needs (SER p. 13). However, classical economic content (e.g. the subject *History of Economic Thought*) might still be too overwhelming for a more (private) business oriented study programme. Taking into account the statements of the graduates, who see the need for more English and more regional and national analysis, the experts suggest reconsidering the composition of the programme according to the needs of the labour markets.

In the case of specialisation *Finance and Banking* the subject *State Taxes and Taxation* is not a typical core element of this type of specialisation. Additionally, taxation should be a part of the mandatory subjects. In some cases, the contents and title do not match exactly. For example, in the subject *Business Accounting* the focus is very clearly on Financial Reporting and Analysis. The content might match with the subject *Financial Analysis*.

Another problem is that some subjects refer to a too large number of (sometimes rather old) books and it is questionable whether the students have access to these books. For example, in the course *Risk Management* there are 5 obligatory and 12 additional books listed. Besides a

Lithuanian textbook on Investment Economics (25 copies available) one book marked as obligatory is not available at all, 3 others only in one or two copies. Additionally, the level of textbooks used in this varies from basic to intermediate inside of the same subject. For example, the textbooks *Theory of financial risks* by Bouchard and *Simulation techniques* by Chan are used, both belonging to the (main) reading list, but normally are used for advanced studies. Therefore, the experts renew the remark of the previous visit, that the literature should be reconsidered and updated more carefully. Additionally, the students the experts met explained that reading the literature on the list is not obligatory and that they use e-books and databases.

The content and methods of the subjects are appropriate for the achieving of the intended learning outcomes of the programme. Considerable proportions of the courses are economic and business-related starting from a basic economic curriculum and leading students through the field of economics and business administration to the special questions within the electives. However, the experts suggest reconsidering the composition of the study programme and the volume of the electives. It might be favourable to reduce this volume make some subject mandatory (e.g. taxes).

The scope of the programme at 210 ECTS is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes of the Bachelor of Economics. The portfolio of different subjects in the programme has sufficient variety and coverage for the bachelor level programme. The specialty courses and the electives are preceded by the courses introducing the methods needed for the later studies in the programme. All subjects have the volume of 4-6 ECTS and have 60 (5 ECTS) or 70 (6 ECTS) contact hours most frequently divided equally between lectures, seminars or practical classes and consultations. However, some students and graduates the experts met wished more proactive teaching methods.

The content of the programme mostly seems to reflect the latest achievements in science. This judgement can be made after analysing by the list of publications of the professors and lecturers (the share of high level journals is very low however) and after looking through by the fact that the study literature which in most cases is up-to-date. However, as mentioned above, some literature list might need an update and the general attitude towards reading might need corrections.

2.3. Teaching staff

According to SER (p. 16, paragraph 70), the composition of the academic staff meets provisions laid out the order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania issued on 30 December 2016, No. V-1168, "On Approval of General Requirements for

Delivery of Studies” and other documents, which state that not less than 50 per cent of the subjects of the first cycle university study subjects in the study field should be delivered by scientists. Out of 31 teachers, 24 hold a PhD (77.4 percent). Academic staff, as according to SER (p. 16, paragraph 69) is distributed as follows: 9.7 percent are professors, 41.9 percent are associate professors, 25.8 are lecturers holding a PhD and 22.6 percent are lecturers without PhD. Professors teach about 29.4 percent of the subjects. From CVs presented to the experts (SER, Annex 4), the teachers have 6-40 years of educational experience (17.7 on average) and 0-30 years of practical experience (6.7 on average), with 9 teachers having less than 2 years practical experience.

From CVs of academic staff (SER, Annex 4) it is evident that staff’s research mostly corresponds to the subject they teach with some deviations. SER (p. 16, paragraph 78) states that the average age of *Economics* study programme academic staff was 46 years in 2017 (41.9 percent under 40, 22.6 percent 41–50, 19.4 percent 51–60, 16.1 per cent over 60). The age structure of the Faculty is rather favourable for conducting academic teaching and research. From the SER (p. 16, paragraph 72), the expert team learnt that 74 percent of teachers gained their practical work experience in various enterprises and organisations, also by implementing project activities. However, during the meetings at ŠU, none of the groups indicated any projects or activities outside of the university, therefore expert team would recommend increasing the possibility for teaching staff to participate in such activities.

As according to the SER (p. 18, paragraph 87), throughout 2012–2016, 25 teachers delivering subjects in the study field have published (separately or in collaboration with co-authors) 6 research studies, 13 teaching aids, 4 articles in ISI Web of Science publications, 3 in ISI Master Journal List publications, 1 article in conference proceedings ISI Proceedings, 75 articles in publications reviewed in international data bases, 30 articles in other reviewed publications, 11 articles in reviewed conference proceedings. However, experts are of opinion that research publications in international journals should increase. The position expressed by the staff members during the meetings that international visibility was not required by law previously, also worries the experts and raises questions regarding staff’s motivation to conduct high quality research.

SER (p. 18, paragraph 88) also states that over the same period, 64.5 per cent of Programme’s teachers and 72 percent of the teachers delivering subjects in the field took part in various international and national projects, which are related to improvement of delivery and content of the Programme, and in addition should have helped teachers develop their qualifications and gain experience of practical work. Yet, the foreign language skills need improvement, as large number of teaching staff relied on translation during the meetings. The

number of staff is more or less adequate to ensure learning outcomes. According to the Annex 3 of SER, most of staff members teach two or more modules and the total number of people teaching this course, 29, likely is on the small side to cover the total of 48 modules taught.

Academic staff's workload, as described in SER (p. 17, paragraph 78), is in compliance with the ŠU Description of the Procedure of Workload Calculation for Teaching and Research Staff Members. Teacher in full-time position works 1584 hrs per academic year: no more than 1056 of those are dedicated to educational work, including no more than 792 hrs of contact work with students (250–640 hrs of in-class work and 542–152 hrs of other contact activities with students) and no less than 264 hrs of non-contact work. Remaining 528 hrs are dedicated to research activities, qualification development, dissemination and organisational activities. During the visit, teaching staff roughly confirmed these statements and had no problem with the workload division.

SER (p. 17, paragraph 75) states that a proper teacher/student ratio is ensured when forming groups (currently is 3.2, has dramatically decreased over the years), by complying normative volumes of flows, groups and sub-groups, which are set in ŠU Description of the Procedure of Workload Calculation for Teaching and Research Staff Members. According to this document, the minimum/maximum number of students in lectures is 25/100, in practical classes, seminars – 15/35, practical classes in sub-groups – 7/22. From meetings with graduates, teachers and administrative staff it is clear for the expert team that maximum number of students is not breached, however minimum threshold seems not to be held and actual number of students is less than minimums stated in SER.

According to SER (pp. 16-17, paragraph 73), in the academic year 2016–2017, for the work with 95 students of the Programme there were allocated 4.5 work positions, i.e. one position of pedagogical staff had approx. 21.1 students. However, as experts found out during the visit, this study program was not started in 2017 (not enough students enrolled) and due to that, in addition to low number of students enrolled in 2015 and 2016, currently the ratio is out of proportion.

SER (p. 16, paragraph 71) claims that majority of academic staff has a vast amount of experience – 74 percent of teachers have been working throughout the entire period under evaluation. As according to the meetings with the staff, two new people have joined the department over past few years.

In SER (p. 16, paragraph 72) it is also stated that perspectives of the turnover of staff are enhanced by the fact that on 8 June 2011, the Minister of Education and Science issued the order awarding ŠU the right to carry out Doctoral studies jointly with other institutions and in academic year 2016–2017, 8 Doctoral students were preparing their Dissertations in the field of Economics, 2 Dissertations having already been defended in 2017. The experts found evidence,

during the meetings at ŠU, that there are people who are currently working on their PhD degrees at ŠU; nevertheless, they did not directly indicate their intentions to join ŠU after getting their PhD.

In SER (p. 17, paragraph 77) it is stated that major ways of qualification development are long-term and short-term secondments, courses, seminars, delivery of presentations at scientific conferences etc. ŠU procedure of qualification development obliges teaching staff members to compulsorily develop their competences in higher education didacticism, foreign language, information management at least twice in 5 years. Expert team, during the visit, found evidence that scientific conferences, presentations and seminars are organized and delivered. Nevertheless, the expert team recommends increasing the attention to foreign language classes.

SER (p. 18, paragraph 82) claims that over the last five years 64 percent of teachers took part in international scientific conferences abroad (27 presentations were delivered), while 88 percent of the teachers participated in conferences in Lithuania (68 presentations were delivered). Though exact numbers were not confirmed, during the meetings thought out the evaluation, participation in scientific conferences was mentioned number of times.

SER (p. 18, paragraph 84) states that since 2012 32 percent of the teachers of subjects in the field were abroad to deliver lectures to foreign students (22 lectures in foreign universities in total).

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The premises of ŠU seem to be adequate in size and quality to provide students with sufficient amount of work area. There are also enough classrooms to hold lectures and other activities for the students. However, during the visit the experts' team observed that in most of the classrooms students can only sit in rows. Experts' team raises a concern that this type of classrooms is not suited for competence-based learning. ŠU should consider improving this situation by making classroom environment more flexible in order to provide possibilities for using different teaching and learning methods necessary in raising general competences of the students. Wireless internet connection is available through all of ŠU premises. During the visit expert team learned that facilities of ŠU are suited for students with disabilities.

Expert team was impressed with new and modern ŠU library. Library is only across the street and is easily accessible to students of the Programme. There is nice atmosphere present and enough of places to relax. Library has 295 workplaces. Library also has a variety of equipment necessary for students with disabilities. Expert team welcomes this approach, but it seems that ŠU does not use this potential to the fullest as this equipment is rarely used and there no students

with disabilities enrolled to the Programme. Library has qualified employees, who are responsible for taking care of little children of the students, who would wish to study in the library. Library is open access for all citizens, but only ŠU students can take books home. During the visit, expert team learned that library computers are not equipped with the specific software, used by the students of the Programme. Individual working rooms are also accessible for students in library. Library also has seminar rooms and two conference rooms.

The teaching and learning equipment are adequate both in size and quality, at least regarding computer equipment. SER (p. 19, paragraph 95) indicates that the Faculty, where the Programme is being carried out, has 211 computers in total allocated to the study process. Expert team considers this to be sufficient for implementation of the study programme.

Expert team commends that, when choosing practice placement, students of the Programme are provided with the possibility to use ŠU database for practice places of previous students.

Teaching materials are not always adequate. SER indicates that there is a number of titles and copies of various publications in available in ŠU library. However, only around 14% of the publications relevant to the implementation of the Programme are in English. This number is relatively low. It was also learned by the expert team during the visit that usually library can offer only one or two examples of books in English. Expert team would encourage ŠU to expand selection of the publications in English. SER (p. 22, paragraph 108) indicates that there are 23 databases subscribed for students in ŠU library.

Whereas the databases subscribed by the library are sufficient for the study process and students can access them in library or from home via VPN service, the same cannot be said regarding teaching material. The teaching material indicated in mandatory references is sometimes scarce in ŠU library, in subjects such as *Philosophy, English for Specific Purposes, Standard Lithuanian for Specific Purposes, Mathematical Logic, and Microeconomics 1 and 2*), sometimes only several copies are available. There is reason to doubt whether there are actually enough learning resources available to students for effective learning as only sometimes there is indicated that electronic versions are available.

In SER (p. 21, paragraph 101) the list of licensed software owned by ŠU is provided. Software includes the computer-aided simulation model ECOSYS, a virtual training programme “Kietas riešutas” (A Hard Nut to Crack), computer model for regional process management (OECOWI), software (ARCGIS), “Ecosys” (macro level) and “Global Challenge”. During the visit, expert team found out that open source software such as PSPP and Gretl is being used in the study process. Though it is sufficient for the study process, experts would recommend acquiring software for which open source analogous is being used. Though it is sufficient for the study process, experts would recommend acquiring software for which open source analogous

are being used. Expert team also learned that most of the software is available only in one of the computer classrooms of the Faculty responsible for the implementation of the study programme. Expert team was also told that “Ecosys” are not available in Faculty computers and is installed to student personal computers during the study subjects where this software is needed and during the writing of the final thesis if it is necessary. This raises concerns whether this is appropriate (and legal) way to work with this software.

2.5. Study process and students’ performance assessment

With some deviating the entrance requirements are in general well-founded, consistent and transparent. Students admitted to the Programme in state funded places have average of around 6 (out of 10) competitive score (SER Annex 7, table 5). It should be noted that average score of students admitted to non-state funded places is quite low with the highest average being around 3,8 and the lowest being around 1,2 (out of 10). This raises concerns whether admitted students are actually able and ready to study in the university.

As already mentioned in section 2.1, there is a large decrease of interest from the students in applying for the study programme. From 2012 to 2016 number of total request dropped from 430 to 109, which is around four times. First priority request dropped from 72 to 26, which is around 2.5 times. Also table 8 from the same Annex 7 indicates that number of admitted students to full-time studies is dropping rapidly and is only 4 on year 2016. Number of admitted students to part-time studies stays approximately the same about 12 students. It was also learned that in 2017 the Programme was not started since it has not managed to attract minimal number of 15 students, which was introduced recently by Lithuanian government. Expert team raises a concern that appropriate measures to improve this situation must be taken. During the visit, it was learned that ŠU solution to this problem is being put to marketing. However, expert team is of the opinion that changes in the curriculum and organisation of separate study programmes have to be done.

In general, the organisation of the study process ensures proper implementation of the Programme and achievement of the intended learning outcomes, although some adjustments need to be done. Timetable of the studies and exam sessions are designed according to the preferences of both students and teachers and has to be approved by the dean of faculty. There is a good distribution of students’ contact hours throughout a week. Also, there seems to be good distribution between student contact and individual study time in both full-time and part-time study types. It is good that ŠU provides students with possibilities to create individual study

plans. It should be also noted that expert team welcomes innovative teaching methods besides lectures, but raises concern that facilities should be more adapted to this.

During the visit, expert team learned that students have no actual possibilities to choose different elective subjects. Since there are relatively few students, administration allows for all students to choose only one elective subject. Despite the possibility for students to make a group decision on the subject, this is in expert team opinion not a satisfactory procedure. The experts' team is aware of the low number of students in the Programme, but it does not provide justification for this kind of organization of study process. The experts' team would stress that the same situation is with the possibilities for students to choose one of three offered specializations. This raises even more concern as some students might be unable to choose specialization of their liking. This situation is serious, since students were informed on the website of ŠU before enrolment to the study programme that they would be able to choose specialization and their legitimate expectations might not be fulfilled.

Students are sometimes encouraged to take part in scientific, artistic or applied science activities. Expert team learned that sometimes students take part in scientific activities. There are some students enrolled in this Programme, who delivered presentations and published articles. However, it should be noted that ŠU could increase student participation in non-local scientific activities. Expert team is convinced that improvement of student participation in scientific activities is needed.

Students' participation in mobility programmes is modest and needs to be further promoted. Expert team learned that possibilities for student international mobility are in place, as according to the SER there are a number of countries where students can have part of their studies. However, students are not encouraged enough to participate in mobility programs. During the meeting with the teaching staff, it was stated that students are also not provided with possibility to choose analogous subjects to their programme in English if they are offered by another study programme. Expert team would raise a point that reconsideration of this practice is needed. This would help to improve English language skills of the students and provide them with confidence to more actively participate in internationalization.

In general, ŠU ensures proper academic and social support. Expert team learned that teachers of the Programme are supportive and able to react to students' needs. Also teaching staff provides consultations to students on designed time. There are also consultations for students and methodological seminars for writing final thesis. There seems to be rather good system in place for providing students with necessary information. Various bodies participate in disseminations of relevant information to the students of Programme. ŠU has a system for first year students' integration. It involves having curators from students and curators-teachers,

organization of Information week. Also environment and study process are adapted to the students with disabilities. Expert team recognizes these practices.

There are two types of scholarships offered by ŠU: incentive grant (38, 57 or 76 EUR) and one-time grants (from 38 to 152 EUR). Social support also includes social scholarships and one-time allowances. Social scholarships are administered by State Studies Foundation. Unfortunately, there is no information in SER regarding how distribution of one-time allowances is done. In comments to this report, HEI stated that all the information is provided in item 145, yet the review team believes that there is no information in that item about scholarships.

Mostly, the system of assessing student achievements is clear, public and appropriate to assess the learning outcomes. Assessment criteria are regulated by ŠU rules and introduced in the first lecture of every subject. Information regarding assessment is available to students in online University Academic Information System. Assessment strategy is clearly described in particular study subject descriptions. During the studies, individual cumulative assessment is applied.

Though teaching methods for different learning outcomes of particular study subject differ, assessment methods usually are used the same to evaluate all of the learning outcomes of the particular study subject. This raises doubts, whether adequate assessment methods are used to evaluate learning outcomes of particular study subject.

During the review of the examination material, expert team also learned that most of the examinations are being carried out in the test format. Student has to choose the right answer from several answers given and sometimes to provide explanation for the answer. Expert team cannot recognize this method of evaluation as a sufficient way to evaluate, whether students have reached learning outcomes of a particular study subject. Expert team strongly recommends revision of the assessment methods used.

Final thesis is assessed by the Commission of Thesis Defence, which consists of 5 members, with at least one social partner included. Final decision on assessment of final thesis is made by the Commission of Thesis Defence, which includes reviews of scientific adviser and reviewer, the presentation of the work and scientific accomplishments of the student. Expert team found that there are different evaluation forms for supervisor and reviewer of the student final thesis. Also criteria in evaluation forms are mostly based on content of the thesis and process of writing it, instead of the learning outcomes demonstrated in the writing of the thesis. In expert team's opinion, evaluation of the final thesis should be adjusted more to the learning outcomes of the Programme.

Professional activities of the majority of Programme graduates do not totally correspond to the expectations of Programme operators and employers. Expert team learned ŠU lacks a more detailed analysis of career paths of graduates. It was stated that students usually find job

placement in the region of Šiauliai. Social partners and graduates confirm that. However, and as mentioned above in Section 2.1, it was understood from the social partners that competence and skills of graduates from this study programme do not differ a lot from graduates of the *Business administration* programme in ŠU. Expert team raises a concern whether or not graduates actually meet the aim of the Programme in their career, and recommend making the appropriate adjustments to the match expectations and reality.

The Programme does not totally correspond to the state economic, social and cultural and future development needs. In SER (p. 7) it is indicated that study programme corresponds to various different analyses. However, it is unclear how this Programme impacts state economics, social and cultural and future development needs. SER states (p. 28, paragraph 156) that study programme „*complies with state demands for economic, social, cultural development and future development*“, but no concrete evidence is provided. ŠU could consider doing the analysis on how study programme corresponds to state and region economic and future development needs, as already mentioned in Section 2.1.

Regarding fair learning environment, the ŠU uses a variety of measures applied to discourage dishonest behaviour. This includes re-taking examination, repeated attendance of a study subject or even elimination from the list of students with a permission to return for studies after 3 years only. However, criteria for applying each of the methods are unclear. Also, ŠU could consider working on measures for preventing unfairness. There is a good initiative of the Students' Representatives being present for observation of examinations. Finally, SER (p. 27, paragraph 149) indicates that students can “*submit complaints, appeals in compliance with public and transparent procedures*”.

2.6. Programme management

Programme management is systematic and meets the standards. The responsibilities of universities' units are well divided and sufficiently described – the system is based on the conception of the Internal Quality Management System for Studies at ŠU (USISMQ). The conception of quality management is public accessible in Lithuanian language (SER p. 29).

ŠU implemented a Quality Assurance System at the university level in 2011 (SER, p. 32). It is very complex and it allows to collect a lot of data, e.g. from students, stakeholders, and staff. Study Programme Committee (SPC) on the departmental level is responsible for quality assurance which should lead to improvement of the Programme (SER, p. 32). Study Quality Monitoring Centre (SQMC) is responsible for quality assurance at the ŠU level. The number of research on quality of studies run by above mentioned units is high. The research covers students

(including first year students), graduates, and staff data analysis (SER, p. 31). According to interviews, the QAS systems works, but it is adapted to the low number of students. It is based on qualitative methods and direct contacts of students with teaching and administration staff. Teachers improve their syllabuses, based on discussions with students and students' experience.

The Programme Management did not respond to the trend of decreasing number of students. The Programme did not start in the academic year 2017/2018, because of the fact there were less than 15 candidates. According to interviews, the senior administrative staff wants to increase marketing activities to attract more candidates. There are no changes planned in the quality of the Programme. Better marketing definitely is needed, but it is not the solution of present problems.

To improve quality, the Council of Social Partners of Study Programmes of the Economics Study Field has been established. The Council meets at least once per year (SER p. 30). ŠU administrates its stakeholders. It has divided them into 3 groups – 1st group: internal, 2nd: external, and 3rd: general. Stakeholders of 1st and 2nd group are involved in all main processes of implementation of the Programme: improvement, marketing, implementation and evaluation. According to interviews, stakeholders are involved in the process of Programme improvement, but alumni are not perceived by the university as a valuable source of possible changes. Expert team suggests that ŠU would utilize the experience and ideas provided by alumni, as they are a valuable asset of the study programme.

The information about the study programme is public and easily accessible – it can be accessed through webpage of the university. However, data provided on the webpage is very general – it does not contain details of the Programme e.g. syllabuses of courses, requirements for thesis, information about staff.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The business orientation of the Programme should be emphasized; and its connection and contribution to the present and future prospects of the regional economy and the regional labour market needs should be also more deeply analysed and, when necessary, explicitly considered in the aims, learning outcomes and contents of the Programme.
2. The internationalization of the Programme should be further promoted by providing students with more possibilities to study in English, increasing the number of subjects taught in English, and fostering the international mobility of students and Faculty members.
3. The curriculum should be reconsidered either by sharpening the economic focus of Programme or by uniting the Programme with a business administration programme. Additionally, the sequence of the Programme should be changed placing more study field subjects at the beginning.
4. The titles of several subjects should be changed towards more familiar names.
5. Literature based studying should play a more important role in the Programme.
6. Experts recommend introducing a more symmetric approach to secure the qualification level of the staff in whole. Parts of the staff should reconsider their attitude towards researching and improve communication skills in English.
7. Facilities and learning resources should be improved, by upgrading the Faculty library to make it more oriented to the study process, acquiring more programme-oriented books to provide students with necessary access to references, and improving the software used in the study process.
8. The methods of assessing students should be reconsidered in order to assure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, rather than to encourage memorisation and repetition of contents.
9. The organisation process for selecting elective subjects and specializations should be reconsidered in order to provide students with open possibilities for selection.
10. Students' participation in scientific activities should be improvement.
11. The focus should be shifted to the quality of the Programme, to respond to the trend of decreasing number of students. It is not enough to respond to the trend just by increasing activities in marketing field.
12. The involvement of alumni in the process of improvement of the Programme should be increased. Alumni are usually very useful and added-value source of information about the Programme, so the university should introduce tools to be able to keep dialogue with them.

13. The name and other defining characteristics of the Programme should be reconsidered, as its focus has changed from *Economics* to *Business Administration* or *Business Economics*, which has made the BA in Economics closer to other programmes, issued by the Šiauliai University, and has opened the question of whether similar programmes should be merged or not.

IV. SUMMARY

The aims and learning outcomes of the Programme comply with the requirements of the local legislation and, in general, can be assessed as satisfactory. They are publicly announced and mostly linked to the academic and professional requirements and, in part, to the state, societal and labour market needs. The aims and learning outcomes of the Programme correspond, in general, to the type and cycle of studies as well as the level of qualifications. In addition, social partners are remarkably involved in the Programme. Nevertheless, the Programme would require some improvements in areas, such as: learning outcomes achieving, public information and, last, but not least, the links between its aims and learning outcomes and the mission, operational objectives and/or strategy of the Higher Education Institution. A major challenge for this Programme is to do with its current bias towards business in a context, in which the Šiauliai University already issues a BA in *Business Administration* and a BA in *Economics and Sustainable Business*. The connection and contribution of the Programme to the regional economy and the labour market needs also call for further attention in terms of Programme aims and learning outcomes.

The Programme structure is in line with the legislative requirements. The subjects of studies are partly taught in a consistent manner, but content of some subjects is repeated. The content of subjects corresponds to the type and cycle of studies. However, the change towards more management-oriented topics decreases the visibility of the economic focus of the Programme. The content of subjects and study methods in general enable to achieve the intended learning outcomes, but the implementation of more activating teaching methods and more lectures in English is useful. The content and the system of choosing electives need corrections. With some restrictions, the scope of the Programme is sufficient to achieve the learning outcomes. The content of the Programme corresponds to newer academic achievements, but there is only a rather small amount of staffs' research oriented to the study field and the attitude towards using literature might need a revision.

The staff composition corresponds to the legislative requirements. Teaching staff seems more or less qualified and their qualifications seem to be adequate to ensure the learning outcomes. Teachers are somewhat engaged in research, nevertheless the quantity and international visibility of research could be increased. Experts worry that some teachers expressed a very formal position towards international research, explaining that it was not conducted, due to the fact that it was not required by law. Also, there is a need to increase the capability of teaching staff to communicate in English. There are enough staff members to ensure learning outcomes. The teaching staff turnover is able to ensure an adequate provision of

the Programme, new young teachers join the staff and there are some PhD students. The higher education institution ensures condition for professional upgrading of staff, nevertheless qualification of different staff members seems to vary sharply, indicating a need of more symmetric approach from administration towards staff's qualification upgrading.

Facilities of the Šiauliai University are sufficient. University has very good library, which provides a lot of possibilities for students. However, there is a lack of references needed for study subjects present at ŠU library. Also, improvement of the software present at the Faculty of ŠU could be improved as well. Expert team welcomes that facilities are suited for students with disabilities and library is equipped with necessary equipment for these students. Classrooms of ŠU, on the other hand, are not suited for competence-based learning and would benefit from improvement.

Organisation of the study process and students' performance assessment is satisfactory. Admission is being carried out in accordance to national regulations. Organisation of the timetables is well-founded and adjusted to the needs of the students. Expert team had noticed that current organisation of selecting elective study subjects and specializations should be improved. Programme has mobility possibilities in place, but students should be more encouraged to benefit from them. In expert team's opinion, scientific activity of the students could also be improved. University provides students with sufficient academic and social support. Expert team found some serious issues with students' performance evaluation system in use. Student evaluation should be more oriented to the assessment of competences, rather than to encourage memorization of the subjects' material.

Programme management is satisfactory. The process of improvement of the Programme is running – based on qualitative methods - but Programme management was not able to respond to the trend of decreasing number of students. Therefore, the Programme did not start in the academic year 2017/2018. It is evident that improvement of this study programme is needed, so it provides higher value to candidates.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Economics* (state code – 6121JX062 (612L10006) at Siauliai 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	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	2
	Total:	13

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Stephan Schöning
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Jakub Brdulak
	Ramon Ramon-Muñoz
	Tautvydas Marčiulaitis
	Ignas Gaižiūnas

**ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
EKONOMIKA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 6121JX062) 2018-03-22
EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-47 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Šiaulių universiteto studijų programa *Ekonomika* (valstybinis kodas – 6121JX062) 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	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	13

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

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

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

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Studijų programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai atitinka vietos teisės aktų reikalavimus ir apskritai gali būti vertinami kaip patenkinami. Jie yra viešai skelbiami ir didžiąja dalimi susieti su akademiniais ir profesiniais reikalavimais ir iš dalies su valstybės, visuomenės ir darbo rinkos poreikiais. Studijų programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai iš esmės atitinka studijų rūšį ir pakopą bei teikiamos kvalifikacijos lygį. Be to, socialiniai partneriai yra puikiai įtraukti į studijų

programą. Vis dėlto reikia tobulinti kai kurias studijų programos sritis, pvz.: studijų rezultatų įgyvendinimą, viešą informavimą ir paskutinę, bet ne mažiau svarbią sritį – sąsajas tarp tikslų, studijų rezultatų ir aukštojo mokslo įstaigos misijos, veiklos tikslų ir (arba) strategijos. Didelis šios studijų programos iššūkis yra susijęs su dabartine jos verslo orientacija, nes Šiaulių universitetas jau vykdo panašias bakalauro studijų programas *Verslo administravimas* ir *Ekonomika ir darnus verslas*. Taip pat reikėtų atkreipti tolesnį dėmesį į studijų programos sąsajas su regiono ekonomika ir darbo rinkos poreikiais bei indėlį į juos, atsižvelgiant į studijų programos tikslus ir studijų rezultatus.

Studijų programos sandara atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus. Studijų dalykai iš dalies dėstomi nuosekliai, tačiau kai kurių dalykų turinys kartojasi. Dalykų turinys atitinka studijų rūšį ir pakopą. Tačiau pakeitus studijų programos pobūdį į labiau į vadybą orientuotas temas, sumažėja studijų programos ekonominės orientacijos matomumas. Dalykų turinys ir studijų metodai apskritai leidžia pasiekti numatomus studijų rezultatus, tačiau būtų naudinga taikyti daugiau aktyvinančių mokymo metodų ir daugiau paskaitų dėstyti anglų kalba. Reikia koreguoti pasirenkamųjų dalykų turinį ir rinkimosi sistemą. Nors yra tam tikrų apribojimų, studijų programos apimtis yra pakankama studijų rezultatams pasiekti. Studijų programos turinys atitinka naujus akademinis pasiekimus, tačiau darbuotojų vykdomų studijų krypties tyrimų kiekis labai mažas ir galbūt reikėtų apsisvarstyti požiūrį į literatūros naudojimą.

Personalo sudėtis atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus. Dėstytojai yra daugiau ar mažiau kvalifikuoti, o jų kvalifikacija atrodo tinkama, siekiant užtikrinti studijų rezultatus. Dėstytojai šiek tiek dalyvauja tiriamojoje veikloje, tačiau tyrimų kiekį ir tarptautinį matomumą reikėtų didinti. Ekspertams nerimą kelia tai, kad kai kurie dėstytojai išreiškė labai oficialią poziciją apie tarptautinius tyrimus, paaiškindami, kad jie nevykdomi, nes to nereikalaujama pagal teisės aktus. Taip pat reikia gerinti dėstytojų bendravimo anglų kalba gebėjimus. Darbuotojų skaičius yra pakankamas studijų rezultatams užtikrinti. Dėstytojų kaita leidžia užtikrinti tinkamą studijų programos vykdymą; prie personalo prisijungia nauji jauni dėstytojai, tarp kurių yra keli doktorantūros studentai. Aukštoji mokykla užtikrina darbuotojų profesinio tobulinimosi sąlygas, tačiau skirtingų darbuotojų kvalifikacija labai skiriasi, o tai rodo simetriškesnio administracijos požiūrio į darbuotojų kvalifikacijos kėlimą poreikį.

Šiaulių universiteto materialioji bazė yra pakankama. Universitetas turi labai gerą biblioteką, kuri suteikia daug galimybių studentams. Tačiau bibliotekoje trūksta šaltinių, kurių reikia studijų dalykams. Taip pat galima atnaujinti ŠU fakultete naudojamą programinę įrangą. Ekspertų grupė puikiai vertina faktą, kad materialioji bazė pritaikyta studentams su negalia, o bibliotekoje yra šiems studentams reikalinga įranga. Kita vertus, ŠU auditorijos nėra tinkamos kompetencija grindžiamam mokymuisi, todėl praverstų jas atnaujinti.

Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas yra geri. Priėmimas vykdomas laikantis nacionalinės teisės normų. Tvarkaraščių sandara pagrįsta ir jie pritaikyti pagal studentų poreikius. Ekspertų grupė pastebėjo, kad būtų galima pagerinti dabartinį pasirenkamųjų dalykų ir specializacijų rinkimosi organizavimą. Studijų programoje sudarytos judumo galimybės, tačiau studentai turėtų būti skatinami daugiau jomis naudotis. Ekspertų nuomone, studentų mokslinė veikla taip pat galėtų būti gerinama. Universitetas teikia studentams pakankamą akademinę ir socialinę paramą. Ekspertų grupė nustatė keletą probleminių aspektų, susijusių su taikoma studentų pasiekimų vertinimo sistema. Studentų vertinimas turėtų būti labiau orientuotas į kompetencijų vertinimą, o ne studijų medžiagos mokymosi mintinai skatinimą.

Programos vadyba yra patenkinama. Studijų programos tobulinimo procesas vykdomas, taikant kokybinius metodus, tačiau studijų programos vadovybė nesugebėjo reaguoti į mažėjančio studentų skaičiaus tendenciją. Todėl 2017/2018 akademiniais metais studijų programa neprasidėjo. Akivaizdu, kad reikia tobulinti studijų programą, kad ji suteiktų didesnę vertę stojantiejiems.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Reikėtų pabrėžti studijų programos verslo orientaciją, taip pat giliau panagrinėti jos sąsajas su dabartinėmis ir būsimomis regiono ekonomikos perspektyvomis bei regiono darbo rinkos poreikiais ir indėlių į juos, ir, prireikus, aiškiai įtraukti tai į studijų programos tikslus, studijų rezultatus ir turinį.
2. Studijų programos tarptautiškumą reikia toliau didinti, suteikiant studentams daugiau galimybių studijuoti anglų kalba, didinant anglų kalba dėstomų dalykų skaičių ir skatinant tarptautinį studentų ir fakulteto darbuotojų judumą.
3. Reikėtų dar kartą apsvarstyti studijų turinį ir arba sustiprinti programos ekonominę kryptį, arba sujungti programą su *Verslo administravimo* studijų programa. Be to, studijų dalykų eiliškumą programoje reikėtų pakeisti, į studijų pradžią perkelti daugiau studijų krypties dalykų.
4. Kelių dalykų pavadinimus vertėtų pakeisti įprastesniais pavadinimais.
5. Studijų programoje svarbesnis vaidmuo turėtų tekti literatūra grindžiamam mokymuisi.
6. Ekspertai rekomenduoja laikytis simetriškesnio požiūrio, siekiant apskritai užtikrinti personalo kvalifikacijos lygį. Kai kurie darbuotojai turėtų apsvarstyti savo požiūrį į tiriamąją veiklą ir pagerinti bendravimo anglų kalba įgūdžius.

7. Materialieji ištekliai turėtų būti gerinami atnaujinant fakulteto bibliotekos fondus, kad juose esanti medžiaga būtų labiau orientuota į studijų eigą, įsigyjant daugiau į studijų programą orientuotų knygų, kad studentai turėtų galimybę susipažinti su šaltiniais, taip pat atnaujinti studijoms naudojamą programinę įrangą.
8. Siekiant užtikrinti numatomus studijų rezultatus, reikėtų dar kartą apsvarstyti studentų vertinimo metodus, o ne skatinti turinio mokymąsi mintinai ir kartojimą.
9. Reikėtų peržiūrėti pasirenkamųjų dalykų ir specializacijų rinkimosi organizavimo procesą, siekiant sudaryti studentams atviras galimybes rinktis.
10. Studentų dalyvavimas mokslinėje veikloje turėtų būti gerinamas.
11. Reaguojant į mažėjančio studentų skaičiaus tendenciją, reikėtų susitelkti į studijų programos kokybę. Nepakanka reaguoti į šią tendenciją tik intensyvinant veiksmus rinkodaros srityje.
12. Alumnus reikėtų labiau įtraukti į studijų programos tobulinimo procesą. Paprastai alumnai yra labai naudingas ir pridėtinę vertę kuriantis informacijos apie studijų programą šaltinis, todėl universitetas turėtų įdiegti priemones, padėsiančias palaikyti su jais dialogą.
13. Reikėtų peržiūrėti studijų programos pavadinimą ir kitas ypatybes, nes jos orientacija pasikeitė iš *ekonomikos* į *verslo administravimą* ar *verslo ekonomiką*, todėl *Ekonomikos* bakalauro studijų programa supanašėjo su kitomis Šiaulių universiteto vykdomomis studijų programomis. Taigi, kyla klausimas, ar nereikėtų sujungti panašių studijų programų.

<...>

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

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)