STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *ANGLŲ FILOLOGIJA*
(valstybinis kodas – 612Q30003)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

———————————————

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *ENGLISH PHILOLOGY*
(state code – 612Q30003)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at KLAIPĖDA UNIVERSITY

1. **Prof. dr. Jānis, Sīlis (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. dr. Srebren, Dizdar,** *academic,*
3. **Prof. dr. Leiv Egil Breivik,** *academic,*
4. **Doc. dr. Linas Selmistraitis,** *academic,*
5. **Ina Rosenaitė,** *representative of social partners',*
6. **Alisa Stunžaitė,** *students' representative.*

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Anglų filologija
Valstybinis kodas	612Q30003
Studijų sritis	Humanitariniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Anglų filologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės studijos (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Anglų filologijos bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2002-06-14

————————————————

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	English Philology
State code	612Q30003
Study area	Humanities
Study field	English Philology
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First cycle
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of English Philology
Date of registration of the study programme	2002-06-14

CONTENTS

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

I. INTRODUCTION

I.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.	During the visit the Team was provided with students' final papers and internship (practice) reports.

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

Together with other KU Faculties, the Faculty of Humanities is responsible for the organization of studies, as well as scientific, cultural, and educational activities. The English and

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

German Philology department performs the research in the field of English Philology, most frequently in the context of other languages and cultures of the Baltic region, and functions as an international disseminator of the research done by the faculty.

The English and German Philology department coordinates not only English Philology, but also English and German/French/Russian languages study programmes. Two years ago the English and German Philology department developed a Master's Degree Study Programme English and Other Foreign Language and Business Communication, giving the opportunity to the bachelor programme's graduates to continue their studies in the Master's programme.

1.1. The Review Team

The review team was completed according Description of experts' recruitment, approved by order No. S-1545 12.08.2014 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *30th. September 2014.*

---

1. Prof. dr. Jānis Sīlis (team leader), *Professor of Faculty of Translation Studies, Ventspils University College, Chairman of the Board of Applied Linguistics Research Center, Latvia.*

2. Prof. dr. Srebren Dizdar, *Professor of Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Sarajevo University, Head of Second Language Acquisition Centre, Bosnia and Herzegovina.*

3. Prof. dr. Leiv Egil Breivik, *Professor Emeritus, Head of Foreign Languages Institute (till 2014.07.01), Bergen University, Norway.*

4. Doc. dr. Linas Selmistraitis, *Associate Professor, Head of English Philology dep., Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, Lithuania.*

5. Ina Rosenaitė, *freelance English-Lithuanian translator and interpreter, Lithuania.*

6. Alisa Stunžaitė, *graduate student of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences Master study programme English Philology.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

In order to have a stable starting point for preliminary evaluation the programme's aims and learning outcomes, the Evaluation Team summarised the strengths and weaknesses of these domains listed during the previous evaluation in 2008, when the Commission decided to grant full accreditation for 6 years and found out that during the six years after the last programme evaluation in 2008 some of the strengths noticed by the previous evaluation team have lost their

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

intensity. Although the English language proficiency level has remained the same (good and very good), the comprehensiveness of the goals of strong language skills, sufficient research training, basic translation ability, and general attitudinal/practical/professional skills needed and appreciated in the job market has been lost (according to the opinion of the graduates and, to a large extent, in the eyes of the present-day employers/social partners).

The professional qualities (especially in linguistic research and translation) expected from the learning outcomes cannot be fully achieved because of the lack of fine-tuned up-to-date teaching materials in linguistics and translation studies.

It seems that, on the one hand, the aim of the programme is to develop philologists with an acceptable level of theoretical knowledge capable of doing research in the discipline. On the other hand, specialists of this kind are more suitable for research jobs in specific institutes and teaching jobs at HEIs, but the labour market, as it is seen above, demands employees with good overall knowledge, written and oral skills in English needed in the jobs of administrators, assistants and consultants for specifically profiled fields of activities. As it is admitted in the Self-assessment report (SER, 2013: 14) this has created a situation when the 2012-2013 data of Klaipėda Labour Exchange Department show 25 unemployed persons with the qualifications of English Philology.

To continue fine-tuning and striving for clarity in defining programme aims and learning outcomes the Evaluation Team suggests to utilise the well-known Tuning methodology (Lokhoff, Wegewijs, Durkin, Wagenaar, González, Isaacs, Rose & Gobbi, 2010. A Tuning Guide to Formulating Degree Programme Profiles Including Programme Competences and Programme Learning Outcomes. Bilbao, Groningen and Hague). Tuning methodology skills will help to define the ability of the would-be graduates to apply the knowledge acquired during studies in enhancing their competitiveness in the labour market, the same can be said about the ability to use ICT technologies.

Evaluation Team's conclusions in the domain of programme aims and learning outcomes after the visit to Klaipėda University:

The programme aims and learning outcomes definitions need to be reformulated and subsequently the programme's structure should be changed, so that the graduates could acquire two specialisations – translators or translators/interpreters (60 ECTS), and teachers of English as a foreign language (60 ECTS). At present programme aims and learning outcomes are in contrast to internship field that predominantly is translation, but themes of the BA papers are mainly in literature (only a small percentage are related to translation problems).

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

The programme aims and learning outcomes are not based on public needs and the needs of the labour market. Meeting students, graduates and employers/social partners the Evaluation Team made sure that majority of the students saw themselves as translators (1st preference) or university lecturers/teachers (2nd preference) after graduation. Graduates, too, stressed that more translation-related subjects should be introduced. Graduates also pointed out that in order to obtain the preferable pedagogical specialisation courses and internship in pedagogics should be introduced, as well another foreign language should be added to enhance the graduates' competitiveness in translation and teaching market. Employers/social partners remarked that, in connection with the study programme under evaluation, their preferences are translators/interpreters who often must act as liaison officers and therefore must be good in liaison interpreting, graduates also need to have skills and abilities in delegations' reception, conference and international events arrangement; graduates have good language skills, but still lack communications skills in educational environment.

The programme aims and learning outcomes formally are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered at present, but, after all meetings with those involved in the programme's implementation the Team has an impression that the programme does not meet expectations of students and employers (see the previous paragraph). The bulk of the students have the aim to become translators (the most preferable choice, the second popular choice is teachers or university lecturer's job). Programme aims and outcomes are not communicated to students as well as they should be (see section „Study process and students' performance assessment"). Therefore the name of the programme – i.e., English Philology, although it is general enough to have enough place of maneuver for much more clearly defined specialisations in translation and pedagogy, has failed to do this – for example, it does not match several of the listed learning outcomes, e.g. C5 of the special skills section says that it is meant "to master translation and interpretation technologies, to apply translation and interpretation procedures in multicultural environment" (SER, p. 9), the same can be said about part of C1 ("to apply translation strategies and methods" – ibid.). Employers' observation that the graduates lack communication skills in educational environment show that social skills-related learning outcome D1 is not met.

The Evaluation Team suggests that in case the programme is changed in the next several years introducing clearly defined and structured translation and pedagogy specialisations with 60 ECTS for each, a new common denomination for the name of the programme should be found, including a clear denotation of the translation and teaching specialisations.

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

Weaknesses:

Programme aims and learning outcomes are in contrast to internship field that predominantly is translation, but themes of the BA papers are mainly in literature (only a small percentage are related to translation problems). The programme aims and learning outcomes are not based on public needs and the needs of the labour market: majority of the students and graduates saw themselves as translators (1st preference) or university lecturers/teachers (2nd preference) after graduation. Employers/social partners' preferences are translators/interpreters often acting as liaison officers and therefore must be good in liaison interpreting. Graduates also need to have skills and abilities in delegations' reception, conference and international events arrangement.

Strengths:

According to the formal requirements the programme aims and learning outcomes in general are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualification offered at present. Also, in the meeting with the Team employers/social partners positively evaluated the graduates' English language skills which match E1 personal skills (SER, p.9).

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design of the English Philology programme is consistent with legal requirements.

On p. 16, the SER states: "The English Philology programme assures the continuity of studies: such programme study subjects as EU institutions, business and marine terminology and others comprise the basis for broader options for further studies in the programmes of other profiles [...]". However, there are no separate subjects dealing with EU institutions and marine terminology in the Programme. EU institutions and marine terminology are only studied as topics alongside many other topics in Modern English courses.

More serious is the lack of system and logical division of topics in the study subjects "English Language" which run through eight semesters. These subjects are not structured in a satisfactory manner, with a natural progression from the topics taught in semester 1 to the topics taught in subsequent semesters. Or to be more specific, one would expect the introductory topics focused on in semester 1 to be continued/followed up more consistently and systematically than they in fact are later in the programme. In semester 1 the study subject covers a variety of areas, e.g. phonetics, the noun, the verb, the adjective, the word and its meaning, the use of synonyms and antonyms, and the spelling of words. In semester 3 the subject is narrowed down to lexicology, writing and syntax. (Incidentally, "analysis of lexical units" and "work with dictionaries", which are listed as "themes", are not themes/topics but methods.) The arbitrariness

9

of the content of the subjects can be illustrated by that fact that in semester 3 there are 27 topics, in semester 2 only 12. All of this shows that there should be more cooperation between the teachers who design the study subjects of "English Language", with a view to arriving at a better structure and a better progression throughout the study subjects. Finally, the content of "English Lexicology" in semester 2 partly overlaps with the content of "English Language 1".

Objections can be raised to the content of the course "Introduction to Germanic Linguistics" (semester 2). It is all very well to place the English language in its historical context, but it would appear that this course goes into too great detail concerning non-English diachronic data and theories about these data.

Some descriptions of study subjects are not complete. Thus the subjects "French Language 1–4" have blank lines where topics should be indicated.

At university level, one would expect more courses in language/linguistics which (like "English Stylistics", "English Lexicology" and "English Language History") have a strong theoretical component.

It should also be mentioned that the summaries of the study subjects do not always accurately reflect the content of studies in the subjects "English Language". Thus in the summary of "English Language 4", we are told that "[t]he course embraces English lexis and syntax." However, this course also includes other important topics, e.g. suprasegmental features (intonation, emphasis), semantics and the interrelationship between semantics and syntax. The summary of "English Language 6" states: "The course consists of lexis and the EU terminology." One would not therefore expect to find topics where other areas are focused on such as "Regional variants of English, their phonetic peculiarities, differences in vocabulary, grammatical characteristics".

Topics on thematic vocabulary development and academic writing are not included in every semester of the study subjects "English Language". In the programme under review, these topics are fragmentary and do not have a systematic character. The inclusion of well-structured components of thematic vocabulary development and academic writing in every semester would help students acquire the best possible skills in these areas.

According to the SER, "a lot of attention is devoted to the translation subjects [...]" (p. 15). However, there are only two subjects dealing with translation: "Translation Theory" (semester 5) and "Practice of Basic Translation" (semester 6).

By and large, the content of the programme reflects recent research in the relevant fields. However, there is good reason to move somewhat away from traditional courses like "Introduction to Germanic Linguistics", and to broaden the student's awareness of the language to include/put more emphasis on linguistic areas of interest which have developed rapidly over

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

the past two-three decades: examples are pragmatics and semantics, sociolinguistics, language varieties and discourse analysis.

Weaknesses:

The most serious flaw of the curriculum design is the lack of system and logical division of topics in the study subjects "English Language" which run through eight semesters. These subjects are not structured in a satisfactory manner, with a natural progression from the topics taught in semester 1 to the topics taught in subsequent semesters. Objections can also be raised to the content of the course "Introduction to Germanic Linguistics", which goes into too great detail concerning non-English diachronic data and theories about these data. In general, there is too little theory in the linguistic part of the programme. At university level, one would expect more courses in language/linguistics with a have a strong theoretical component. Topics on thematic vocabulary development and academic writing are fragmentary and do not have a systematic character. In the linguistic part of the curriculum, there is too little emphasis on areas like pragmatics and sociololinguistics that have come to the forefront in linguistic research in recent decades.

Strengths:

In general, the content of the programme reflects recent research in the relevant fields (although more emphasis should have been put on linguistic areas of interest which have developed rapidly over the past two-three decades, e.g. pragmatics, sociolinguistics, language varieties, and discourse analysis).

2.3. Teaching staff

The teaching staff of English Philology study programme consists of 9 teachers from the department where the programme is implemented and 3 teachers from other departments (12 teachers holding 8.7 full-time positions): 1 prof. dr. (1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE), 1 prof. habil. dr. (0.5 FTE), 4 assoc. prof. dr. (3.0 FTE), 2 lecturers (1.6 FTE), and 4 assistants (2.6 FTE). Thus, researchers take up 4.5 FTE and non-researchers 4.2 FTE. The SER says that the composition of the academic staff that implements English Philology study programme complies with the Descriptor of General Requirements for Degree Awarding First Cycle and Integrated Study Programmes (approved by Order No. V-501, 09-04-2010, of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania) in accordance with which at least half of the study field subjects are to be taught by researchers. It is obvious that the ratio of researchers taking FTE is higher than 50 % of the total teaching staff. However, it is quite difficult to calculate the exact volume of the subjects taught by researchers because several of the study subjects are delivered simultaneously by a researcher and a teacher without a scientific degree as it is

11

indicated in Annex No. 1. During the visit the teaching staff explained that one of the teachers is a supervisor and the other teacher delivers lectures / seminars. This explanation did not clarify the matter.

In order to satisfy the abovementioned requirements some teachers holding PhD teach more than five subjects which shows the concentration of the majority of subjects in the same core teachers' hands. The same teachers supervise the majority of BA thesis (one of them 7 theses for 0.5 FTE). Such workload can impede staff research and other qualification development activities.

The teaching staff is employed full time by the University and selected and hired in accordance with the general requirements of Klaipeda University. Pedagogical and scientific work of the teaching staff is assessed in attesting procedures every five years.

The ratio of the programme implementing staff and students currently stands at 1: 8.25 which is sufficient for the programme.

The minimal turnover (1 teacher retired) and the stability of the teaching team is a great asset of the programme and its further development, since it facilitates the formation of strategies, and continuous stream of improvements and enhancements. In recent years the programme benefited from new members of the staff in terms of research and younger teaching age average: 1 professor and 3 lecturers were employed (lecturers became doctoral students). This level of turnover ensures appropriate 'new blood' while maintaining stability.

The age profile of the teaching team is satisfactory. 6 staff members of the English and German Philology Department are over 50 years old and have long professional, teaching and research experience. The rest 3 members of the staff are younger than 40. It means that 10 year time range from 40 to 50 is not covered by the teaching staff which can lead to the lack of teachers with significant professional experience when those who are over 60 retire.

Only some of the staff members participated in research projects: 2 teachers in 2011, 5 teachers in 2012. One member of the staff was actively involved in projects in 2006-2012 when she was working at Mykolas Romeris University but the teacher joined Klaipeda University only in 2012. The department neither initiated nor acted as a partner in national or international projects.

The SER says that over the period of 2008-2013, quite a number of articles and abstracts of presentations related to the programme subjects were published. Unfortunately, the SER does not provide the exact numbers of publications over the period. From the staff CVs (one CV is missing in Annex No. 5) it is obvious that the leading members of teaching staff publish research articles and teaching aids. As it could be calculated from CVs the average number of

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

publications produced by the teaching staff per year is 7.5 (37 publications in the period 2008-2013).

However, some members of the teaching staff do not participate in any professional development activities and do not produce publications.

Visiting professors from other European universities are giving lectures at Klaipeda University: in 2008-2013 only 5 visiting professors came to the University.

Albeit speaking several languages quite a few teachers of the programme take part in the academic exchange and teach abroad. CVs indicate that only 1 teacher went for ERASMUS teaching visit. Only for 4 teachers delivered presentations at the conferences.

The Department has 2 foreign professors working on a regular basis: 1 from the USA and 1 from Germany.

The Department does not have research directions in which research is carried out. Publications of staff members depend on their individual interests. A lack of research strategy at the department's level diminish the Department's possibilities to join research consortiums and exploit research funding that is available at European level.

Weaknesses:

The teaching staff does not use Erasmus exchange opportunity. The teaching staff does not develop professionally on a regular base. The majority of workload is delivered by the same core teachers: some teachers read from 5 to 7 courses and supervise from 5 to 7 BA thesis. Half of the teaching staff does not produce publication and does not participate at the conferences. The teaching staff does not initiate projects.

Strengths:

The teaching staff is with solid professional teaching experience. Good student and teacher ratio in the programme which allows the teaching staff to provide academic support for the students. Dedication of the teaching staff to ensure aims and learning results of the programme. There are two native speakers in the programme.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The site visit created an impression that the lecture rooms, practical classrooms, furniture, audiovisual aids, internet access and basic computer facilities are appropriate for study activities; the library building conforms to the standards and has up-to-date facilities in the form of online catalogue and electronic databases.

The premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality; however there is no evidence as to the provision of teachers still do not have adequate workplaces and computer facilities – 3 computers for the whole teaching staff of the programmes (and evidently all the

13

other programmes of the faculty), not even writing tables for each of the staff members, not to speak of individual offices which were vaguely promised by the faculty administration to be fixed up in some distant future.

The teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are adequate both in size and quality. However, CAT tools (translation software of the Trados type) should be purchased and used in practical translation classes.

There is an improvement compared with the situation in 2008 when the last evaluation of the programme was held: the specialised journals needed for the programme now can be found in databases.

During the meeting with the Team students have pointed out that many books in the University library are outdated, this is also proved by the literature lists in course descriptions (e.g., O'Grady, W., Dobrovolsky M. 1992, Lyons, J. 1994 in Introduction to Linguistics; Arsenjeva, M. 1980 in Introduction to Germanic Linguistics; Arnold, I. V. 1986 in English Lexicology etc.).

Weaknesses:

Teachers still do not have adequate workplaces and computer facilities – 3 computers for the whole teaching staff of the programmes, no individual writing tables for the staff members. There are no translation software working places in computer classes.

Strengths:

The premises for studies, teaching and learning equipment (computers) are adequate both in their size and quality. There is a constant tendency of improvement as to the volume of purchased books and development of teaching materials, although there is still a room for improvement.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The University organises admission in accordance with the Lithuanian legal requirements provided for in the Law No. V-2486 of the Ministry of Education and Science. Over the last five years the number of students admitted each year is around 30; however the dropout rate is considerably high – up to 36%.

During the visit, it was learned that the students of this study programme are planning to work either as teachers or translators, however, the study programme does not provide for possibility to obtain teaching qualification and offers too little translation subjects – either optional or compulsory. Since philology is a wide subject, this particular study programme lacks an indication of what aspect of philology students will study. Students also indicated that in the beginning of the programme they were not provided with a full list of their academic disciplines

14

and were not really aware of what the learning outcomes will be, some of them were under the impression that they will obtain good translations skills. In the real world, philology graduates may find positions in various structures and fields, however a clearer description of the programme and outcome of these studies would help students to understand what skills they would be able to achieve and what are their future career prospects.

During our visit, students expressed an opinion that there was a lack of practice in the first three years of study. Usually, they carry out their practice doing translations for different translation agencies. They thought that such internships should begin in the second or third year, leaving more time for bachelor thesis during the fourth year. Also, some practice could be carried out in other institutions – schools, publishing houses, companies, running English language courses.

Another area of weakness in this programme is low participation in academic research. Students are not encouraged to take part in academic conferences or do a joint research with their teachers. Also, they said that there simply was no information or discussions about such events.

In 2012 English and German Philology Department has established The English Club. Students are well informed about the activities of this club and the events and lectures organised by this club are popular among students s of all the university.

Students have representatives in University's Senate. The SER report states that students are active in the Students' Council, however during our meeting they expressed an opinion that this Council does not carry out any functions.

Students have very good opportunities and are very much encouraged to participate in the mobility programmes, even without passing a prior test, but are reluctant to travel (most stated that due to the family reasons they need to stay in Klaipėda) and the participation is very low.

The University provides proper academic support. Teachers are available for consultations; their schedules are well organised and clear. Individual consultation options are available with all members of the academic staff. Students are able to choose topics for their final thesis. They also stressed the possibility to postpone their studies and graduation as much as they wish.

Students stated that their opinion is sometimes taken into consideration when making decisions regarding development of the study programme, but generally students are not encouraged to participate in the decision making process.

Students have possibility to get a scholarship for academic excellence to get this scholarship a student must have an average mark of 9.8., which is very high. The SER also lists a number of different scholarships (business, KU Senate, etc.); however, students were not aware of them.

The assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available in the internet. The assessment of each module is introduced at the beginning of a semester.

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

Social partners were quite positive about this programme; they are willing to offer practice to the students. Some social partners said that lack of general knowledge was an obstacle to offer them wider field of internship. Social partners were not really involved in discussions about the altering the programme to the market needs.

Weaknesses:

Students are not familiar with the learning outcomes of the programme. Students complete their practice in the field of translations; therefore the programme has nothing to do with the translation studies. Students do not have many possibilities to participate in the institutional bodies of the university.

Strengths:

Students are involved in additional university activities; they are willing to participate in the events organized by the English Club.

2.6. Programme management

Based on the documents presented, in particular the sections from the External assessment Final Report from 2008 and SER from 2013 it is evident that regulations concerning monitoring and implementation of the programme have been well-defined and developed, especially in the areas where the External assessment Final report had already commended the internal procedures and their actual performance in practice. Due to a strict hierarchy of allocating responsibilities for decisions within Klaipeda University, it is evident that the Department is active in performing regular duties in view of day-to-day management of all activities related to the Programme, but it seems quite passive in either proposing certain initiatives for improving various areas of both academic and management activities, or trying to be heard in view of dealing with vital issues that may well affect the future developments of the programme. More decision-making at the Department micro-level is rather strongly needed and it should be suggested to take place within the reasonable amount of time in current Klaipeda University/Faculty of Humanities/Department structure. Overall, it seems from the outside evaluation that the current programme management runs correctly only in terms of performing regular activities, whereas there is a lack of vision for the new developments and improvements that the Programme is in a dire need of.

There has been plenty of data offered for evaluation, and they have been primarily gathered and processed within the Department. At least twice a year, relevant pieces of information have been discussed in the Department and certain measures have been suggested concerning some minor improvements or correction at the Department level, whereas larger issues go through the Faculty as an intermediary between the Department and KU Senate. Students and external stakeholders (local business and alumni) also take part in these discussions, or relevant

16

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

information has been readily made available for them, which, in turn, creates a positive feedback from both sides and initiates some debate, but without any visible changes as to the running the programme, or creating a positive environment for some major improvements in the current structure or its performance.

This seemed a particularly strong point that, in documents submitted, a professional attitude was displayed among the academic staff. They do take seriously both internal and external suggestions in order to improve their programme, and the general attitude towards PM is timely structured within the envisaged three years cycle. However it seems to be quite reasonable, despite the fact that KU English Philology operates on 4-years BA study system, that the more comprehensive outcomes of possible improvements could only be seen once the particular cohort of students does go through the whole period of study.

Stakeholders seem to be both interested and active in the process. Students' overall participation and involvement in the PM has been formally established, and there are a number of informal ways they can participate in the process. However, it appears that the Alumni Career centre has not been involved in any particular activity of PM improvement at any level, which needs to be definitely changed in the period to come, and more interaction of this segment must be also felt at the Department level.

The set of quality insurance measures have been presented in a clear and transparent way, but despite its apparent advantages, it has not gained in momentum, especially with the support and involvement of external stakeholders, who seem to be quite interested in KU graduates as their potential employees, properly prepared to enter the labour market after finishing their studies. That is why the Department should try to invest more time and energy for making the quality insurance both efficient and effective in order to benefit from their potential outcomes, both on a short-term, but also, even more so, on longer-time basis.

Strengths and weaknesses:

The positive aspects of programme management can be identified only in the willingness of the Department leadership and academic staff to become more involved in the process that may eventually yield some advancement as compared to their current situation; whereas their passive attitude in handling these matters with more bottom-up initiatives and their invisibility on academic and, generally, on a larger picture can be seen as major drawbacks.

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Area of programme aims and learning outcomes:

1. The programme aims and learning outcomes definitions need to be reformulated and subsequently the programme's structure should be changed, so that the graduates could acquire two specialisations – translators or translators/interpreters (60 ECTS), and teachers of English as a foreign language (60 ECTS).

2. In case the above-recommended changes are made, a new common denomination (after consultation with national-level HE authorities) should be found and reflected in the programme title.

Area of curriculum development:

1. The structure of the courses in "English Language 1–8" should be revised, with a view to arriving at a better structure and a better progression.

2. The content of "English Lexicology" (semester 2) and/or the content of "English Language 1" should be revised to remove the overlap.

3. The content of the course "Introduction to Germanic Linguistics" should be revised and made more relevant to the study of the English language.

4. The missing information in the descriptions of the subjects "French Language 1–4" should be supplied.

5. The number of courses with a strong theoretical component should be increased.

6. The summaries of "English Language 4" and "English Language 6" should be revised so that they accurately reflect the content of studies in the subjects.

7. Topics on thematic vocabulary development and academic writing should better structured and included in every semester of the study subjects "English Language".

8. The linguistic part of the curriculum should, as whole, put more emphasis on areas like pragmatics and sociololinguistics that have come to the forefront in linguistic research in the past two-three decades.

Area of teaching staff:

1. Building researchers groups with an experienced leader. The number of research groups should not be large; each group should cover an important research section.

2. Increasing number of publications and ensure dissemination of research results. The programme and faculty administration should find means to stimulate the academic staff to intensify publishing not only locally, but at least on the regional level.

3. Attending professional development courses and to create a strategy of professional development. Experienced colleagues from other Lithuanian, Baltic States and other EU universities should be invited to conduct these courses.

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

4. Using opportunities of going abroad provided by Erasmus+ programme – there undoubtedly should be universities with which Erasmus teacher mobility programmes' agreements have been signed.

5. Encouraging motivation of teaching staff to participate in projects, professional development courses, programme management and publication of research results.

Area of facilities and learning resources:

1. Solving of the problem of adequate staff workplaces and computer facilities should start at once and not in some undefined future.

2. A minimal amount of translation software should be purchased and installed in computerised classrooms.

Area of study process and students' performance assessment:

1. The programme should provide students with a teacher's qualification.

2. Students should be introduced with a full list of academic disciplines at the beginning of each semester.

3. The internships should be introduced in the 3rd year of studies.

4. Students should be diverse concerning the choice of the internship places, more possibilities to carry out the practice elsewhere than in the translation agencies should be introduced.

5. Information about the possibilities of academic research should be available for the students.

6. Students should increase their participation in the research.

7. Students' Council should be reorganized or gain more power in expressing their opinion at University's Senate.

8. Students should have more power altering the study programme.

9. A lower average mark should be introduced for obtaining scholarships of academic excellence.

Area of programme management:

1. It is of utmost importance for KU English Philology Department to become rather active in handling not only day-to-day matters in all the areas within the scope of their direct responsibilities (academic, professional and management issues) but also in terms of their involvement in the structures of KU, as well as to strengthen their participation and presence on both national (Lithuanian) and international (primarily central European and Scandinavian) levels in order to be more visible and, consequently, more attractive to their future students and business-oriented environment. This refers in particular to younger academic staff striving to meet high criteria of academic excellence and

19

promotion into higher ranks. There is a dire need of writing and publishing within their areas of expertise, but even more so to present such academic and professional papers at international gatherings and in journals and other publications of a kind.

2. The more comprehensive outcomes of possible improvements in terms of programme management could be expected only if the level of interaction within the department, between the Department and KU structures, and, especially, between the Department and external stakeholders are planned with an avid awareness that the feedback received from all the parties involved in the process must become the backbone of a concrete measures to be applied on both short and long-term basis.

IV. EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE*
* if there are any to be shared as a good practice

V. SUMMARY

Main positive quality aspects of each programme evaluation area:

Area of programme aims and learning outcomes:

According to the formal requirements the programme aims and learning outcomes in general are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualification offered at present.

Area of curriculum development:

In general, the content of the programme reflects recent research in the relevant fields (although more emphasis should have been put on linguistic areas of interest which have developed rapidly over the past two-three decades, e.g. pragmatics, sociolinguistics, language varieties, and discourse analysis).

Area of teaching staff:

The teaching staff is with solid professional teaching experience. Good student and teacher ratio in the programme which allows the teaching staff to provide academic support for the students. Dedication of the teaching staff to ensure aims and learning results of the programme. There are two native speakers in the programme.

Area of facilities and learning resources:

The premises for studies, teaching and learning equipment (computers) are adequate both in their size and quality. There is a constant tendency of improvement as to the volume of purchased books and development of teaching materials, although there is still a room for improvement.

20

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

Area of study process and students' performance assessment:

Students are involved in additional university activities; they are willing to participate in the events organized by the English Club.

Area of programme management:

The positive aspects of programme management can be identified only in the willingness of the Department leadership and academic staff to become more involved in the process that may eventually yield some advancement as compared to their current situation.

Main negative quality aspects of each programme evaluation area:

Area of programme aims and learning outcomes:

Programme aims and learning outcomes are in contrast to the internship field that predominantly is translation, but themes of the BA papers are mainly in literature (only a small percentage are related to translation problems). The programme aims and learning outcomes are not based on public needs and the needs of the labour market: majority of the students and graduates saw themselves as translators (1st preference) or university lecturers/teachers (2nd preference) after graduation. Employers/social partners' preferences are translators/interpreters often acting as liaison officers and therefore must be good in liaison interpreting; graduates also need to have skills and abilities in delegations' reception, conference and international events arrangement.

Area of curriculum development:

The most serious flaw of the curriculum design is the lack of system and logical division of topics in the study subjects "English Language" which run through eight semesters. These subjects are not structured in a satisfactory manner, with a natural progression from the topics taught in semester 1 to the topics taught in subsequent semesters. Objections can also be raised to the content of the course "Introduction to Germanic Linguistics", which goes into too great detail concerning non-English diachronic data and theories about these data. In general, there is too little theory in the linguistic part of the programme. At university level, one would expect more courses in language/linguistics with a have a strong theoretical component. Topics on thematic vocabulary development and academic writing are fragmentary and do not have a systematic character. In the linguistic part of the curriculum, there is too little emphasis on areas like pragmatics and sociololinguistics that have come to the forefront in linguistic research in recent decades.

Area of teaching staff:

The teaching staff does not use Erasmus exchange opportunity. The teaching staff does not develop professionally on a regular base. The majority of workload is delivered by the same

21

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

core teachers: some teachers read from 5 to 7 courses and supervise from 5 to 7 BA thesis. Half of the teaching staff does not produce publication and does not participate at the conferences. The teaching staff does not initiate projects.

Area of facilities and teaching resources:

Teachers still do not have adequate workplaces and computer facilities – 3 computers for the whole teaching staff of the programmes, no individual writing tables for the staff members. There are no translation software working places in computer classes.

Area of study process and students' performance assessment:

Students are not familiar with the learning outcomes of the programme. Students complete their practice in the field of translations, therefore the programme has nothing to do with the translation studies. Students do not have many possibilities to participate in the institutional bodies of the university.

Area of programme management:

Passive attitude of the Department and teaching staff in handling the programme improvement matters with more bottom-up initiatives and their invisibility on academic and, generally, on a larger picture can be seen as major drawbacks.

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme English Philology (state code – 612Q30003) at Klaipėda University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	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: Prof. dr. Jānis Sīlis

Grupės nariai:
Team members: Prof. dr. Srebren Dizdar

                                 Prof. dr. Leiv Egil Breivik

                                 Doc. dr. Linas Selmistraitis

                                 Ina Rosenaitė

                                 Alisa Stunžaitė

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
ANGLŲ FILOLOGIJA **(VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612Q30003) 2014-11-21**
EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-560 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Anglų filologija* (valstybinis kodas – 612Q30003) 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)
<...>

V. SANTRAUKA

Pagrindinės teigiamos programos savybės pagal vertinimo sritis:
Programos tikslų ir numatomų studijų rezultatų sritis:

Pagal oficialius reikalavimus, programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai iš esmės atitinka studijų rūšį, pakopą ir šiuo metu suteikiamą kvalifikacijų lygį.

Programos sandaros sritis:

Apskritai, programos turinyje atsispindi naujausi susijusių sričių moksliniai tyrimai, nors daugiau dėmesio turėjo būti skiriama toms svarbioms lingvistikos sritims, kurios sparčiai vystėsi

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

pastaruosius du–tris dešimtmečius, pvz., pragmatikai, sociolingvistikai, kalbų įvairovei ir diskurso analizei.

Personalo sritis:

Dėstytojai turi svarią profesinę pedagoginę patirtį. Geras šios programos studentų ir dėstytojų santykis užtikrina dėstytojų akademinės pagalbos studentams teikimo galimybę. Atsidavę dėstytojai padeda užtikrinti programos tikslų ir numatomų studijų rezultatų įgyvendinimą. Šioje programoje dėsto du gimtakalbiai anglų kalbos dėstytojai.

Materialiųjų išteklių sritis:

Studijoms skirtos patalpos, įranga (kompiuteriai) yra tinkamos ir jų pakanka. Nuolat įsigyjama naujų knygų, gerinami metodiniai ištekliai, nors dar yra ką tobulinti.

Studijų eigos ir jos vertinimo sritis:

Studentai dalyvauja ir kitoje universiteto veikloje; jie noriai dalyvauja Anglų kalbos entuziastų klubo organizuojamuose renginiuose.

Programos vadybos sritis:

Teigiamu programos vadybos aspektu būtų galima laikyti Katedros vadovybės ir dėstytojų ryžtą aktyviau dalyvauti procese, kuris ilgainiui galėtų užtikrinti tam tikrą pažangą, palyginti su dabartine jų padėtimi.

Pagrindinės neigiamos programos savybės pagal vertinimo sritis:

Programos tikslų ir numatomų studijų rezultatų sritis:

Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai neatitinka praktikos krypties, kuri iš esmės yra vertimas, o bakalauro baigiamųjų darbų temos daugiausia yra literatūrinės (tik nedidelė jų dalis susijusi su vertimo klausimais). Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai nėra pagrįsti visuomenės ir darbo rinkos poreikiais: daugelis studentų ir absolventų manė, kad baigę jie dirbs vertėjais (1 pirmenybė) arba universitetų dėstytojais ar mokytojais (2 pirmenybė). Darbdaviai ar socialiniai partneriai pirmenybę teikia vertėjams žodžiu ar raštu, kurie paprastai dirba ryšių palaikymo darbuotojais, todėl turi būti geri šios srities (*liason interpreters – ryšių, susitikimų) vertėjai ir aiškintojai*) specialistai; be to, absolventams reikia turėti įgūdžių ir gebėjimų priimti delegacijas, organizuoti konferencijas ir tarptautinius renginius.

Programos sandaros sritis:

25

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

Didžiausias programos sandaros trūkumas yra nesistemingas ir nelogiškas studijų dalyko „Anglų kalba", kuris dėstomas visus aštuonis semestrus, temų pasiskirstymas. Šie studijų dalykai nėra tinkamai struktūruoti, natūraliai plėtojant juos nuo 1 semestrą dėstomų dalykų prie tų, kurie dėstomi vėlesniais semestrais. Be to, galima nepritarti studijų dalyko „Germanų kalbotyros įvadas" turiniui, kuriame pernelyg detalizuojami diachroniniai ne anglų kalbos duomenys ir su šiais duomenimis susijusios teorijos. Apskritai, lingvistinėje programos dalyje teorijos pateikiama per mažai. Paprastai tikimasi, kad universiteto lygmeniu turėtų būti dėstoma daugiau teorinių kalbos (lingvistikos) dalykų. Teminių žodynų ir akademinio rašymo temos yra fragmentiškos, nesistemiškos. Lingvistinėje studijų turinio dalyje per mažai dėmesio skiriama kai kurioms sritims, pavyzdžiui, pragmatikai ir sociolingvistikai, kurios pastaraisiais dešimtmečiais tapo pagrindiniu lingvistinių tyrimų objektu.

Personalo sritis:
Akademinis personalas nepasinaudoja „Erasmus" mainų galimybėmis. Dėstytojai savo profesinius įgūdžius tobulina nereguliariai. Didžioji darbo krūvio dalis tenka tiems patiems pagrindiniams dėstytojams: kai kurie dėstytojai dėsto 5–7 dalykus ir vadovauja 5–7 bakalauro baigiamąjį darbą rašantiems studentams. Pusė akademinio personalo neskelbia straipsnių ir nedalyvauja konferencijose. Dėstytojai neinicijuoja projektų.

Materialiųjų išteklių sritis:
Dėstytojai vis dar neturi tinkamų darbo vietų ir kompiuterių – visiems programas įgyvendinantiems dėstytojams skirti 3 kompiuteriai, darbuotojai neturi atskirų rašomųjų stalų. Kompiuterių klasėse nėra programinei vertimo įrangai skirtų darbo vietų.

Studijų eigos ir jos vertinimo sritis:
Studentai nėra susipažinę su programos numatomais studijų rezultatais. Jie atlieka su vertimu susijusią praktiką, o šioje programoje per mažai dėmesio skiriama vertimo studijoms. Studentai neturi daug galimybių dalyvauti universiteto (savivaldos) organų veikloje.

Programos vadybos sritis:
Kad pagerėtų programos vadyba, jos tobulinimo iniciatyvose turėtų dalyvauti visi Katedros darbuotojai ir dėstytojai, nuo žemiausio iki aukščiausio lygio, ir jų indėlis į programos tobulinimą turėtų būti akivaizdus tiek akademinėje, tiek platesnėje aplinkoje.

<…>

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

Programos tikslų ir numatomų studijų rezultatų sritis:

1. Reikia performuluoti programos tikslų ir numatomų studijų rezultatų apibrėžtis; tada reikėtų pakeisti programos sandarą, kad absolventai galėtų įgyti dvi specializacijas – vertėjo raštu ir (arba) žodžiu (60 ECTS kreditų) ir anglų, kaip užsienio kalbos, mokytojo (60 ECTS kreditų).

2. Jei būtų padaryti pirmiau rekomenduojami pakeitimai, reikėtų pasitarti su nacionalinio lygmens aukštojo mokslo įstaigomis ir suformuluoti naują apibrėžimą, atsispindėsiantį programos pavadinime.

Programos sandaros sritis:

1. Reikėtų persvarstyti studijų dalykų „Anglų kalba 1–8" sandarą, siekiant ją pagerinti ir užtikrinti didesnį nuoseklumą.

2. Siekiant išvengti dubliavimosi, reikėtų persvarstyti studijų dalyko „Anglų kalbos leksikologija" (2 semestras) ir (arba) „Anglų kalba 1" turinius.

3. Reikėtų persvarstyti dalyko „Germanų kalbotyros įvadas" turinį ir labiau jį susieti su anglų kalbos studijomis.

4. „Prancūzų kalba 1–4" dalykų aprašus reikėtų papildyti trūkstama informacija.

5. Reikėtų padidinti dalykų, turinčių tvirtą teorinę dalį, skaičių.

6. Reikėtų persvarstyti dalykų „Anglų kalba 4" ir „Anglų kalba 6" santraukas, kad jose atsispindėtų tikslus šių dalykų studijų turinys.

7. Reikėtų pagerinti teminių žodynų sudarymo bei akademinio rašymo temų struktūrą ir kiekvieną semestrą įtraukti šias temas į studijų dalyką „Anglų kalba".

8. Apskritai, programos lingvistinėje dalyje reikėtų daugiau dėmesio skirti tokioms sritims kaip pragmatika ir sociolingvistika, kurios per pastaruosius du–tris dešimtmečius tapo pagrindiniu lingvistinių tyrinėjimų objektu.

Personalo sritis:

1. Sudaryti tyrėjų grupes, kurioms vadovautų patyręs vadovas. Tyrėjų grupių neturėtų būti daug; kiekviena grupė turėtų pasirinkti svarbią tyrimų sritį.

2. Padidinti publikacijų skaičių ir užtikrinti mokslinių tyrimų rezultatų sklaidą bei platinimą. Programos vadovai ir fakulteto administracija turėtų ieškoti priemonių, kaip paskatinti akademinį personalą skelbti publikacijas ne tik vietos, bet ir bent jau regiono mastu.

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

3. Dalyvauti profesinio tobulėjimo kursuose ir parengti profesinio tobulėjimo strategiją. Šiems kursams dėstyti reikėtų pasikviesti patyrusių kolegų iš Lietuvos, taip pat kitų Baltijos ir Europos Sąjungos šalių universitetų.

4. Pasinaudoti „Erasmus+" programos teikiamomis galimybėmis išvykti į užsienį – neabejotinai turėtų būti universitetų, su kuriais pasirašytos sutartys pagal „Erasmus" dėstytojų judumo programas.

5. Didinti dėstytojų motyvaciją dalyvauti projektuose, profesinės kvalifikacijos tobulinimo kursuose, programos vadyboje ir skelbti mokslinių tyrimų rezultatus.

Materialiųjų išteklių sritis:

1. Reikėtų nedelsiant, o ne kažkada ateityje spręsti tinkamų personalo darbo vietų ir kompiuterinės įrangos problemą.

2. Reikėtų įsigyti ir kompiuterių klasėse įdiegti būtiniausią programinės vertimo įrangos kiekį.

Studijų eigos ir jos vertinimo sritis:

1. Ši programa turėtų suteikti studentams mokytojo kvalifikaciją.

2. Kiekvieno semestro pradžioje studentams turėtų būti pateikiamas išsamus akademinių dalykų sąrašas.

3. Praktika turėtų būti pradedama trečiaisiais studijų metais.

4. Studentams turėtų būti suteikiama galimybė rinktis įvairesnes vietas praktikai atlikti nei vien tik vertimų biurai.

5. Studentams turėtų būti suteikiama informacija apie akademinių tyrimų galimybes.

6. Studentai turėtų aktyviau dalyvauti atliekant mokslinius tyrimus.

7. Studentų tarybą reikėtų pertvarkyti arba suteikti jai daugiau galimybių savo nuomonei Universiteto senate pareikšti.

8. Studentams turėtų būti suteikiama daugiau galimybių keisti šią studijų programą.

9. Turėtų būti sumažintas balų vidurkis, reikalingas stipendijai už pažangumą mokantis gauti.

Programos vadybos sritis:

1. Be galo svarbu, kad KU Anglų filologijos katedra pakankamai aktyviai spręstų ne tik kasdienius jos tiesioginės atsakomybės srities klausimus (akademinius, profesinius ir vadybos), bet ir dalyvautų KU struktūros gyvenime, stiprintų dalyvavimą nacionaliniu (Lietuvos) ir tarptautiniu (visų pirma, Centrinės Europos ir Skandinavijos) lygmeniu, kad būtų labiau matoma.

28

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

Taip ji taptų patrauklesnė būsimiems studentams ir į verslą orientuotai aplinkai. Tai ypač taikytina jaunesniajam akademiniam personalui, kuris siekia atitikti aukštus mokslinės kompetencijos ir paaukštinimo kriterijus. Labai svarbu rašyti ir skelbti savo kompetencijos srities darbus, bet dar svarbiau šiuos mokslinius ir profesinius straipsnius ar pranešimus pateikti tarptautiniuose susibūrimuose bei žurnaluose ar kituose panašiuose leidiniuose.

2. Programos vadyba pagerėtų, jei daugiau dėmesio būtų skiriama Katedros darbuotojų tarpusavio bendravimui, bendravimui tarp Katedros ir KU struktūrų ir ypač bendravimui su išorės socialiniais dalininkais, palaikomas grįžtamasis ryšys su visomis šiame procese dalyvaujančiomis šalimis ir atsižvelgiant į jų pasiūlymus priimamos konkrečios trumpalaikės ir ilgalaikės priemonės.

<...>

_____

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)

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras