STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
DARNAUS VYSTYMOSI KOMUNIKACIJA
(valstybinis kodas - 621P90004)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS
———————————————————————

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *COMMUNICATION FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT*
(*state code - 621P90004*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Vilnius University

1. **Prof. dr. Steven Knowlton (team leader)** *academic,*

2. **Assoc. Prof. dr. Martine van Selm,** *academic,*

3. **Assoc. Prof. dr. Baiba Holma,** *academic,*

4. **Assoc. Prof. dr. Dorte Madsen,** *academic,*

5. **Mr. Žilvinas Kulvinskis,** *representative of social partners,*

6. **Ms. Gabrielė Gendvilaitė,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator – Ms. Dovilė Stonkutė.

Vilnius
2015

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	*Darnaus vystymosi komunikacija*
Valstybinis kodas	621P90004
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Komunikacija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (1.5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	90
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Komunikacijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2010.01.14

_____

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	*Communication for Sustainable Development*
State code	621P90004
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Communication
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1.5)
Volume of the study programme in credits	90
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Communication
Date of registration of the study programme	14 January, 2010

CONTENTS

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	Current number of students per year (2014/2015)
2	Guide How to Write a Master's Thesis (17 pages in English)

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

The Master in the Communication of Sustainable Development at Vilnius University was introduced in 1998. The programme was created to address a perceived need in Lithuanian higher education and to be consistent with global initiatives, such as the UNESCO Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. The programme is a result of the project Interdisciplinary Joint Master Studies of Sustainable Development of Society (DARNA) under Measure 2.5 of the Single Programming Document (BPD2004-ESF-2.50-03-05/0081) (2008) and developed in cooperation with Kaunas University of Technology and Mykolas Romeris University; during the implementation of the study programme an internal collaboration was created between three faculties: Faculty of Communication, Kaunas Humanitarian Faculty and the Faculty of Natural Sciences. The programme was evaluated in 2012, and the recommendations from this evaluation have been incorporated in the programme as presented in the self-evaluation report from 2014.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. 1-01-151 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *28 April, 2015*.

1. **Prof. dr. Steven Knowlton (team leader)**, *Professor of Journalism, chair, M.A. International Journalism Studies, 2008-2011, Chair, B.A. Journalism, 2012-13, Dublin City University, Ireland.*
2. **Assoc. Prof. dr. Martine van Selm,** *Director of College of Communication, Department of Communication Science, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.*
3. **Assoc. Prof. dr. Baiba Holma,** *Department of Information and Library Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Latvia, Latvia.*
4. **Assoc. Prof. dr. Dorte Madsen,** *Dept. of Intercultural Communication and Management, Copenhagen Business School (CBS), Denmark.*
5. **Mr. Žilvinas Kulvinskis,** *Head of Public Relations and marketing department at VšĮ „Lietuvos radijas ir televizija"(National radio and television), Lithuania.*
6. **Ms. Gabrielė Gendvilaitė,** *student of Šiauliai University study programme Lithuanian philology and communication.*

Evaluation coordinator – Ms. Dovilė Stonkutė.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The name of the programme, its contents and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other and consistent with the type and level of studies and the award of a Master degree. The programme aims and learning outcomes are publicly accessible. As described in the SER (p. 7), the learning outcomes are adapted to changes in the political situation related to sustainability and CSR, and to the changing reality of business organisations and NGOs, and their activities in the field. Members of the Study Programme Committee and academic staff participate in Lithuanian sustainability and CSR network, as well as in international organizations.

The Self-evaluation report (SER) from 2014 accounts for the changes to the programme to comply with the recommendations put forward in previous evaluation in 2012. One major recommendation is that the programme needed to increase the "sustainable development" part of the curriculum. According to the SER (p. 10), several changes have been made in the study programme, including the introduction of two new courses:

- Nature and Environment
- Equal opportunity policy

The programme is composed of courses from the field of sustainable development as well as courses from the field of communication. The connection – interface between the two fields is not addressed in great detail and should be developed in terms of specifying more what the added value of combining the two fields are. How do the two fields – *together* – create a new set of competences? The SER (p. 7) notes that "Sustainability and CSR are the fields that are known in quite fragmented contexts", and the rationale of the programme is to create a field that aims to connect what is fragmented. It is recommended that the interface between the two fields is developed conceptually accounting for the two fields' interaction, including how the interaction between communication and sustainability is translated into practices that integrate perspectives. As far as appears from the documentation, it is only the CSR course description that addresses both fields. In the meeting with students it was confirmed that the integration between the two fields is something that the students are supposed to do. Students explained, for instance, that in the courses in Sustainability no references are made to the courses on Communication, and vice versa; instead students themselves were supposed to make these interconnecting links. But such

integration does not happen automatically and the evaluation panel would recommend that such processes of integration as well as any connection points between the two fields are further developed in the course descriptions, including the course literature. Thus, further elaboration of the rationale of combining the two fields and of a coherent core of the programme could strengthen and sharpen the core competencies of graduates. Therefore the panel encourages the Study Programme Committee to be more ambitious in articulating the added value of the combination of the two fields and make sure that the added value is reflected in the learning outcomes.

In terms of learning outcomes, a general observation of the team is that major part of the objectives and outcomes focus on 'understanding' and 'knowledge' (see for instance Corporate Communication) but it is not clear what students should be able to *do* with that knowledge and understanding. How do knowledge and/or understanding translate into student activities and job tasks? The evaluation team appreciates that modules progress from theoretical to practical, from comprehension to application. Still, a learning outcome must be able to be assessed and the only way that can happen is if students can do something assessable.

Overall, the relation of programme aims to learning outcomes is not clearly spelled out as clearly as it should be. In some of the course descriptions, there is a lack of distinction between learning objectives and learning outcomes. And learning outcomes are not aligned with assessment criteria. Introducing a clear differentiation could contribute to clearer and more precisely defined programme aims and learning outcomes. In the understanding of the team, objectives are *intended* results or consequences of instruction, curricula, programmes, or activities. Outcomes are *achieved* results or consequences of what was learned; i.e. evidence that learning took place. And the assessment criteria should reflect the outcomes.

Examples:
- *Communication and Information Science Research Methodology for sustainable development*: Assessment criteria do not relate to learning outcomes. And there is no indication of what "correct answers" might represent. Likewise there seems to be misalignment between assessment strategy, examination format and purpose of the course.
- *Communication Theories*: Learning objectives and outcomes are not distinguished. No alignment between (missing) outcomes and assessment criteria.
- *Nature and environment*: No indication at all of assessment criteria. How does the student know which competences might be represented by "perfect knowledge and skills"? Compare for instance with the *Corporate Social Responsibility* course description and its transparent assessment criteria.

It is suggested that the course descriptions *Corporate Social Responsibility* and/or *Intellectual Property Law* might serve as models for describing how competences are demonstrated in the assessment. *Intellectual Property Law*: Learning outcomes are differentiated from learning objectives, and the assessment criteria describe in detail which competencies students should demonstrate. Furthermore, the differentiation between "excellent, very good, good, fair, etc. knowledge and abilities" are described in terms of the concrete course.

The *Master thesis* course description's assessment criteria refer to "the Faculty of Communication Guidelines" with a link to a pdf-file in Lithuanian. And there is no articulation of criteria that would make an evaluation of alignment between assessment criteria, learning outcomes and learning objectives possible. However, during the review team's visit it turned out that a "Guide How to Write a Master's Thesis" does in fact exist in English and that this guide contains a recommended grading system for the assessment of final theses in which the criteria

are explicated in a commendable and transparent level of detail. This guideline is an important document that should have been included in the documentation for this evaluation, either separately or with the assessment criteria incorporated into the Master thesis course description.

2.2. Curriculum design
The curriculum design meets legal requirements. As appears from the SER, the study programme is composed of seven compulsory courses, two optional courses which are selected by students from eight offered courses, and two subjects allocated for scientific research. The total amount of credits of compulsory courses is 42, i.e. more than 46% of the total study programme volume. 12 credits in two semesters are allocated for optional courses, i.e. 13% of the scientific research (6 credits) and Master thesis (30 credits) – that is 40% of the programme volume. Study subjects are spread evenly and their themes are not repetitive. New courses introduced following the evaluation in 2012 show attempts at creating a good balance between study subjects and themes. The content of the subjects and/or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies. This is for instance evidenced in the way students' work in scientific research projects and Master theses must combine the areas of sustainable development, social responsibility and communication.

The programme is an interesting mix of courses from the field of sustainable development as well as courses from the field of communication and a good mix of compulsory and other relevant optional courses. However, it is difficult to identify the "convergence of different approaches" mentioned in the SER (p. 4). As argued above, the core of the programme is not fully elaborated and the learning outcomes are, generally, not aligned. This translates into a lack of transparency in the mix of courses. Which courses exactly, individually or combined, provide the foundational framework for the set of core competencies that students will develop? And which course literature informs the core of the programme? The core theories of the courses should be incorporated into the conceptual underpinnings of the programme. That is, the interface between the Communication side of the programme and the Sustainable Development side is not made as clearly and as specifically as it should be.

The team's observations on a selection of course descriptions might provide an input to such considerations:
The concept of paradigm appears in the course title of: *Sustainable Development Paradigm and Policy,* and the course of *Economic and Social Tendencies of Sustainable Development* addresses the "Economic development paradigm". This sparks the question of any philosophy of science elements in this programme. Where are they? This question is related to the above comment on the interface between the two fields of sustainable development and communication, respectively. To which extent do paradigms collide in the interdisciplinary field of the programme? And how are these issues conceptualized and tackled in the courses, in Scientific Research and in the Master thesis? From the study of Master theses during the visit the panel did not see a focus on specific core literature.

Other observations: Discourse is mentioned in the courses:
- *Corporate Social Responsibility*
- *Equal Opportunities Policy*
- *Risk and Change Management*
- *Communication and Information Science Research Methodology for sustainable development* (including Critical discourse analysis)

However, no literature on discourse is included in the course literature. The use of the term "discourse" can be ambiguous. Perhaps a differentiation could be made between (critical)

discourse theory as an academic field and the more general use of "discourse" as meaning communication generally.

The programme is a timely response to a societal need. And the curriculum generally seems to reflect the latest achievements in science, art and technologies. However, the review team noted that the *Corporate Social Responsibility* course mentions "Analysis of theoretical approach to risk society. Risk communication, discourse on risk communication, risk communication related to corporate social responsibility, research" without including a reference to Ulrich Beck's 'risk society' in the literature.

2.3. Teaching staff
The programme is provided by relevant teaching staff who meets legal requirements. Based on the SER (p.16), the staff of the programme is composed of: "2 professors (primary position), 4 associate professors (3 of them - primary position at the Faculty), 5 lecturers doctors (3 of them in the primary position and the other 2 working in the primary position in MOSTA and other Universities)". Since the evaluation in 2012 that recommended more teachers with practical experience, 3 new lecturers have been included into the programme. The qualifications, the number, and the stability of teaching staff are sufficient to ensure learning outcomes. According to the SER (p. 17-18) the teaching staff of the programme is involved in research directly related to the study programme, and the review team did not find any evidence to the contrary.

From the SER it also appears that beyond staff from the Faculty of Communication, the programme includes researchers from the Faculty of Natural Sciences, Vilnius University as well as from VU Kaunas Faculty of Humanities, respectively. The team considers such composition of staff to be a very promising basis for developing the conceptual interdisciplinary framework of the programme's core, supplemented by inputs from lecturers with experience from practice and that of the social partners.

However, initial attempts to address this question during the team's meeting with lecturers did not resonate well with the lecturers represented, maybe because this meeting also included lecturers from another programme and/or because the lecturers present were not involved in the overall framework of the programme.

In terms of course descriptions and the teachers' involvement with the elaboration of learning outcomes and assessment criteria, the teachers clarified for the team during the meeting that they have the instruments to fulfil university requirements for grading but the review team did not get further insights into for instance how new teachers learn about and train how to perform assessments.

The panel encourages the programme to make the assessment criteria more transparent when aligning learning objectives and outcomes. The team was left with the general impression that teachers are highly qualified and well-liked by students, but that cooperation between course units is scarce, which is further confirmed by the lack of alignment between learning objectives, learning outcomes and assessment criteria as well as lack of coordination between individual course units.

According to the SER (p. 17-18), the Faculty provides funding possibilities for teaching staff for professional development, for instance to participate in seminars, conferences and courses, as well as memberships of professional associations. Furthermore, teachers in the programme are invited to take part in international scientific conferences on Communication Sciences, Corporate Social Responsibility, Economics and Management in the context of Sustainable Development, Gender studies, Film and modern media, etc.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

Premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality. There are enough classrooms, areas for individual and group work. The lack of auditoriums, laboratories and other teaching space mentioned in the 2012 evaluation has clearly been remedied. As described in the SER, all auditoriums are equipped with stationary multimedia equipment, and there is internet connection. The Faculty's computer labs are equipped with software for various purposes such as data collection and analysis (Atlas.ti; SPSS); this software is for instance used in the course on Methodology and in preparation of scientific research and Master thesis; furthermore, work packages as MS Office Project Manager are used in the Project Management course, but can also be used in other courses for instance for communication planning, etc. Audio and video recording and montage software is also available to students.

Students may also use the services of Science Information and Communication Centre (the MKIC) which opened in 2012 and is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except public holidays. Textbooks are issued daily from 9 am to 6 pm. Students can use the 432 ordinary working places, 11 group work and seminar classrooms with a total of 185 working places. MKIC has Wi-Fi internet connection and workstations for laptop computers. Vilnius University Library provides access to all library subscription databases using VPN service, meaning students at home can search for information and access subscription databases in the MKIC and other reading rooms of the library. Technical opportunities of the library allow free scanning and copying the required study materials. *Moodle* is known and used by most of the students. In other words, facilities seem to offer anything a student (or member of staff) in 2015 could possibly wish for.

However, it is noted in the SER (p. 20) that literature – both print and online – that sustainable development available in the library is still not sufficient, and that the nature of available literature not always meets students' needs during the studies. The team believes that this perceived shortage of literature is not necessarily due to shortcomings of the university but may rather be ascribed to the nature of an emerging field for which the textbooks have not been written yet.

The SER does not contain any information on adequate arrangements for students' practice, and the brevity of the team's visit made it impossible to determine first-hand.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes, see however comments above about the learning outcomes.

The admission requirements are in accordance with Lithuanian law. The majority of applicants are graduates of the Faculty of Communication, Vilnius University, but there are also applicants from other study fields who successfully pass the entrance examination. According to the SER, these applicants are mainly Vilnius University graduates of Humanities or Social Sciences; others come from the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, or from Vilnius Gediminas Technical University. Applicants with a background in communications studies are not required to pass an entrance exam, which is a requirement that applicants from another study field than communication have to satisfy. The structure of the exam is: two theoretical questions, related to basic knowledge in communication and sustainability, and a question on applicant's motivation to enter the study programme. The admission requirements are well-founded.

The study process and assessment system appear to be adequate for purpose. According to the SER (p. 23) students are encouraged to present results of their research in scientific articles, or to

present findings in various discussions, and some students and graduates of the programme have submitted scientific articles based on their Master's thesis. Students have opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes, and for the spring semester 2014/2015 the first two students from the programme are going on exchange at Lyon University, France and at Zagreb University, Croatia. And in 2013 a student from the programme participated in International Student Summer School in Jarocin, Poland. Students can get scholarships for good academic achievements and there is also support for students who are socially vulnerable. There is an adequate level of academic and social support.

According to the SER, the procedure of assessment of master students' knowledge and competences is laid down in course descriptions, and during the first week of each semester, the teacher presents students with the plan and acquaints students with the content of the module. The assessment system is clear, adequate and publicly available; however, the assessment criteria as addressed above need further alignment with the learning outcomes.

Students participate in evaluations by filling in questionnaires and discussions with the teaching staff. However, the panel did not find any proof of formal feedback of the evaluation findings to the students.

According to the SER (p. 24), the results of a graduates' surveys show that most of the graduates work in an area that is different from that of their Master studies; thus it is difficult to ascertain to which extent professional activities of the majority of graduates meet the programme providers' expectations. Only one graduate stated that she works in an area that is related with the study programme. However, it is also noted, that 45% of graduates have been promoted in their existing jobs since graduation. It is difficult to judge the effectiveness of the programme in relation to the provision of graduate competence because the programme is quite new and only 21 students as of January 2015 have graduated. And most of the students who had graduated from the programme were already in employment before they enrolled.

2.6. Programme management

According to the SER (p. 26) responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated for the programme management, monitoring, and implementation; information and data on the implementation of the programme are collected and analysed twice a year. Meeting with students is organised twice a year, together with the Faculty's student representatives. Further a committee sitting is organised twice a year focussing on revisions of the study programme. According to the SER, results of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme; internal study quality evaluation is performed with regard to the opinion of teachers – experts of the field as well as students, feedback from employers and graduates of the programme.

However, it is not clear to the review team where the overall responsibility for the coherence of the programme, alignment of learning outcomes and knowledge sharing between teachers, is allocated and how this allocation is translated into practice. The evaluation team recommends that a document clearly delineating these tasks be created and followed. Given the great strength in the area of organisational management present in the teaching staff, this should not be unduly burdensome. The team recommends that the Study Programme Committee considers this or alternative ways to achieve at a programme level what is, intellectually, similar to the learning objectives, learning outcomes and assessment methods that are part of the curriculum.

As stated above, the learning outcomes part of the study programme need substantial overhaul. In module after module, learning outcomes are stated as things students will "understand" or

"learn." Learning outcomes must be things the students are able to *do* and then measurement devices developed to test whether the students can do them.

This is a new field and this programme is still very much a work in progress. Corporate and institutional communication is an established field; sustainability less so. Integrating the two concepts happens in student thesis topics and, to a degree, within the curriculum itself. The interface between the two ideas will benefit from further conceptual development as time goes on. The evaluation team wishes to stress that this does not mean that the programme, in concept, is not a good one; the team clearly believes that it is – socially responsible, timely and potentially very popular.

The 2012 evaluation recommended that the programme should substantially increase its ties to and connections with the professional community. According to the SER, Faculty has taken an active role in strengthening collaboration with external stakeholders. Stakeholders have been invited to become members of the Study Programme Committee, they participate in defense commissions of Master thesis, and they are in general invited to meetings with students and to participate in various events.

Since the 2012 evaluation, it seems that the interaction with stakeholders has increased, and new courses to strengthen the "sustainable development" part of the curriculum were included. However, the lack of stability and maturity within the programme, as suggested by the 2012 evaluation, still seems notable.

The SER notes that comparable programmes across Europe are studied for strengths which may be incorporated into this study programme, but there are no examples of this. The evaluation team believes that in a new area of study such as this one, a great deal could be learned from other programmes, which are similarly new and similarly facing a shortage of truly relevant literature.

A serious shortcoming of the programme is that the two parts of the programme – the Communication part and the Sustainable Development part – are too rarely integrated. Based upon an examination of the content of the modules in the programme, it appears that the module on Corporate Social Responsibility comes the closest to connecting the two sides of the programme, but even there, "sustainable development" is far narrower than "corporate responsibility". For a programme billing itself as Communication for Sustainable Development, there needs to be much tighter integration than there appears to be at present. When the students were asked where the two parts were put together, they replied that they were expected to forge those links themselves.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The programme needs to develop its conceptual foundation in terms of the interaction between the fields of communication and sustainable development, to clearly articulate the added value of the combination of the two fields and thus strengthen and sharpen the core competencies of graduates and their employability.
2. The programme should rewrite 'Learning Outcomes':'Understanding' and 'knowledge' presently in course descriptions should be translated into Learning Outcomes that articulate what students should be able to *do* with that knowledge and understanding.
3. Programme aims and learning outcomes should be aligned with assessment criteria.

4. The programme should substantially increase the knowledge sharing between the staff involved in delivering the programme.

IV. SUMMARY

The programme is a timely response to a societal need. However, the study field of the programme needs more conceptual development and theoretical foundation. The curriculum is an interesting mix of courses that witnesses an ambitious effort at providing a relevant specialisation in an emerging field. Nevertheless, the current curriculum needs better coherence and better alignment as well as explicitation of learning outcomes with learning objectives and assessment criteria. The composition of teaching staff from different disciplines forms a solid basis for delivering of courses, and teachers are highly qualified and well-liked by students. Still, teachers involved in the programme need to coordinate efforts more to create a more coherent programme. The new library contains anything a student may wish for; although literature on the combination of communication and sustainable development may be scarce, the programme should continuously monitor opportunities for enhancement of library holdings. Students are encouraged to participate in research and have opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes. Only one graduate works in an area that is related with the study programme. The programme has strengthened its ties with social partners and included teaching staff with experience from practice.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Communication for Sustainable Development* (state code – 621P90004) at Vilniuς 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	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	4
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. Steven Knowlton
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Martine van Selm
	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Baiba Holma
	Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dorte Madsen
	Mr. Žilvinas Kulvinskis
	Mrs. Gabrielė Gendvilaitė

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
DARNAUS VYSTYMOSI KOMUNIKACIJA **(VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621P90004)**
2015-06-10 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-128-1 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Vilniaus universiteto studijų programa *Darnaus vystymosi komunikacija* (valstybinis kodas – 621P90004) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	4
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

Ši studijų programa – laiku pateikiamas atsakas į visuomenės poreikius. Tačiau studijų programos krypčiai reikia daugiau konceptualumo ir teorinio pagrindo. Studijų turinys – įdomus dalykų derinys, rodantis ambicingas pastangas suteikti atitinkamą naujos srities specializaciją. Nepaisant to, dabartinį studijų turinį reikia susieti ir suderinti geriau, o studijų rezultatus suderinti su studijų tikslais ir vertinimo kriterijais. Dėstytojų komanda, kurią sudaro skirtingų disciplinų dėstytojai, sudaro tvirtą dėstymo pagrindą. Dėstytojai yra aukštos kvalifikacijos, studentai juos mėgsta. Vis dėlto programą vykdantys dėstytojai turi labiau koordinuoti veiksmus, siekdami užtikrinti programos darną. Naujoje bibliotekoje studentai gali rasti visko, ko pageidauja; nors literatūra apie komunikacijos ir darnaus vystymosi susiejimą gali būti reta, programoje reikėtų nuolat stebėti galimybes tobulinti bibliotekos fondą. Studentai skatinami dalyvauti moksliniuose tyrimuose ir išnaudoti galimybes dalyvauti studentų judumo programose. Su studijų programa susijusioje srityje dirba tik vienas absolventas. Programoje sustiprinti ryšiai su socialiniais partneriais, įtraukta dėstytojų, turinčių praktinės patirties.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Reikia išplėtoti programos konceptualųjį pagrindą susiejant komunikacijos ir darnaus vystymosi sritis, aiškiai pabrėžti šių dviejų krypčių derinimo pridėtinę vertę ir taip sustiprinti ir akcentuoti pagrindines absolventų kompetencijas ir jų galimybes įsidarbinti.
2. Turėtų būti perrašyti programos studijų rezultatai: šiuo metu aprašuose egzistuojančios sąvokos „supratimas" ir „žinios" turi tapti studijų rezultatais, aiškiai nurodančiais, ką studentai turėtų gebėti įgiję šias žinias ir supratimą.
3. Programos tikslus ir studijų rezultatus reikia suderinti su vertinimo kriterijais.
4. Programoje reikėtų gerokai padidinti keitimąsi informacija tarp ją vykdančių dėstytojų.

<...>

_____

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)