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**INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the study programme</th>
<th>Publishing and Advertising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State code</td>
<td>612P40001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study field</td>
<td>Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of the study programme</td>
<td>University studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study cycle</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study mode (length in years)</td>
<td>Full-time studies (4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of the study programme in credits</td>
<td>240 ECTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded</td>
<td>Bachelor of Publishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Date of registration of the study programme | 7th June 2004, under the Order of the Minister of the Ministry for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania No. ISAK-852.
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V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme Publishing and Advertising (state code – 612P40001) at Vilnius University is given a positive evaluation.

*Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Evaluation Area</th>
<th>Evaluation of an area in points*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Programme aims and learning outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Curriculum design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Teaching staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Facilities and learning resources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Study process and students’ performance assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Programme management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.*

IV. SUMMARY

The Publishing and Advertising programme of the Faculty of Communication of Vilnius University clearly caters to an existing demand, both from students and from the labour market, and does so to the satisfaction of both, as testified by all stakeholders (students, social partners and graduates). The conclusion of the Panel is that overall the programme merits the qualification ‘good’.

More specifically, the following strong points and points for potential improvement were identified.

The programme aims and intended learning outcomes are well described and advertised. However, the programme revision and improvement process could be further streamlined, with more systematic input from students and alumni, as well as – possibly – from the industry. It was noted that the name of the programme ‘Publishing and advertising’ is a source of significant potential confusion, and it was recommended to change it to ‘Publishing and marketing’.

The curriculum offers a judicious mix of theory and practice, and the publishing and marketing parts are in fact well integrated. To ensure the future relevance of the programme, a wider and more global perspective of the book industry (i.e., other fields than trade publishing, but also bookselling) could be taken. Also, although the programme is an academic and not a professional one, it would be sensible to keep the subjects up to the current state of the art, if only in order to aid students’ motivation. The study subjects on literature could be made more relevant to the programme’s core concerns if they were taught from a publishing perspective.

The programme employs the right mixture of industry and academic staff. Staff were found to be well qualified, and the research output can be regarded as adequate for a BA programme. Nevertheless, potential vulnerabilities were identified in the teaching by staff from other faculties and in the relatively low research output.
Facilities and learning resources were found to be good. The ambitious Publishing Lab was noted as a good initiative, even if its current facilities are a little cramped. Though good, there was room for improvement in the selection of library resources: the selection of especially print resources could be enlarged and brought up to date. Arrangements for student practical experience involving social partners (internships et cetera) as well as staff (e.g., research) exist and are adequate, but could be improved.

Assessment of study process and students' performance is good, if possibly somewhat informal. The Study Programme Committee was found very willing to take into account student surveys and to display flexibility in responding to them.

Programme management is good. The SER shows a proper level of awareness of most issues that could potentially threaten the programme. However, some quality improvement processes could be streamlined, for example by assigning clearer responsibilities to the individual Programme Committee members and defining the role of the Chair of the Committee. Also it should be considered to make participation in student surveys compulsory as currently students do not always make use of the possibility.

<...>

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Consider placing greater emphasis on the international orientation of the programme. Further, as the programme is at present predominantly focused on trade publishing, the Review Panel recommend to broaden the scope of the programme by including other segments of the book industry.

2. The Review Panel consider the name of the programme partially misleading as it implies that publishers use promotion techniques that are not typical for publishing. Due to the fact that study subjects such as Marketing, Management Consumer Behavior, Public Relations, Brand Strategy and Theory of Economics cover the basics of marketing, the Review Panel recommend changing the name of the programme from Publishing and Advertising to Publishing and Marketing or Publishing and Communication.

3. The Review Panel recommend that a greater variety of teaching methods is employed. The greater the variety of teaching methods, the better the programme can use the varying aptitudes and abilities of students, and the easier it will be for students to achieve intended learning outcomes.

4. The Panel recommend ensuring a greater measure of integration of the contents of the study subjects taught by staff from other faculties. Notably, literature subjects taught by the Faculty of Philology would gain enormously in relevance if they took a publishing studies perspective.

5. The Review Panel recommend that those teaching staff from the business who teach whole study subjects should be included in the trainings organised by the Faculty – or at least be given the possibility to join them.

6. The Panel recommend compulsory surveys for the students in order to obtain a higher response rate and better overview of student opinions about the programme.

7. The site visit revealed that the Study Programme Committee members are responsible for separate parts of the study programme. However, it was not clear who is responsible for coordination of all changes and improvements proposed by the Committee members in order to produce a coherent study programme. The Panel therefore recommend to better define
responsibilities of the Study Programme Committee members and especially of the Chair of the Committee.

8. The Panel recommend to more clearly allocate responsibilities for monitoring of the implementation and daily execution of the programme.

<...>