



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

LIETUVOS SVEIKATOS MOKSLŲ UNIVERSITETO
GYVŪNINIŲ IŠTEKLIŲ VALDYMAS PROGRAMOS
(621D91001)

VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *ANIMAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT* (621D91001)
STUDY PROGRAMME
AT LITHUANIAN UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

Grupės vadovas:
Team Leader:

Prof. Dr. Ulf Magnusson

Michael Pearson

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. Dr. Thomas Wittek

Gediminas Vagonis

Inga Kalpakovaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Gyvūninių išteklių valdymas
Valstybinis kodas	621D91001
Studijų sritis	Biomedicinos mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Žemės ūkis ir veterinarija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė, 2 metai
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Gyvūnų mokslo magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	25-07-2011, Įsak. nr. 1-01-98

INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme	Animal resources management
State code	621D91001
Study area	Biomedical Sciences
Study field	Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Level of studies	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time, 2 years
Scope of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of animal science
Date of registration of the study programme	25-07-2011, Order No 1-01-98

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

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS.....	4
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	4
2. Curriculum design	6
3. Staff	8
4. Facilities and learning resources	10
5. Study process and student assessment	11
6. Programme management.....	13
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	14
IV. SUMMARY	14
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT.....	16

I. INTRODUCTION

The study programme evaluated is the Master study programme in Animal Resources Management (state code - 621D91001) at the Lithuanian University of Health Sciences. The programme commenced in 2011.

The current evaluation report has been produced by an international expert team with the following members: Ulf Magnusson (team leader), Professor at the Swedish University of Agricultural Science, Uppsala; Michael Pearson, Principal of Gurteen College, Ireland; Thomas Wittek, Professor at Veterinary University Vienna, Austria; Gediminas Vagonis, Senior specialist at the Ministry of Agriculture, Lithuania and Inga Kalpakovaitė, Bachelors student at Vilnius University, Lithuania.

The evaluation is based on a comprehensive self-evaluation report (and annexed material) produced by a team at the Lithuanian University of Health Sciences and on findings gathered during a site visit (25 March, 2014) which included a tour through the on-campus teaching facilities and meetings with university, faculty and department management, as well as with teachers, students, alumni and external stakeholders (social partners) invited by the Department of Animal Sciences.

The team acknowledges that external factors such as changes in the employment market, student funding, reorganisation of the academy and university, and other external factors may have had significant influence on the evaluated study programme. However, it is beyond the scope of the team to assess these factors.

Even though the current report deals with the Master programme in Animal Resources Management the team evaluated two other programmes, a Bachelor and a Master programme in Animal Husbandry. Also, during the site visit the new BSc programme in Animal Science at the university was briefly discussed. The elaborations in this report should be seen in this context.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The aims and objectives of the programme refer to the requirements set by the Ministry of Education and Science. The programme aims and intended learning outcomes (ILOs) have

been described and provided in a table in the Self-evaluation report (SER). They are divided into five principal categories:

1. Knowledge and its application;
2. Research skills;
3. Subject – special skills;
4. Social skills;
5. Personal skills.

The ILOs are well defined; however, especially in category 1 all 3 ILOs do not refer to active use and application of the knowledge but only of passive knowledge (e.g. 1.1. **To know** newest technological achievements, ideas and principles of livestock breeding, keeping, handling, maintenance, feeding and nutrition, to understand possibilities, assumptions and limitations of their practical application; 1.2. **To have deep knowledge** of animal production, animal welfare and health and factors influencing animal production quality; 1.3 **To know** and understand the principles of animal production process management, methods, problems and ways of their solutions).

The number of aims is rather high (15) and some of them are very general comprising very wide sectors. The best examples are the already mentioned ILOs of category 1. These ILOs especially points 1.1 and 1.3 comprising enormous range of knowledge which seems impossible to achieve. The expert panel recommends reviewing and focusing the ILOs.

Information about the study programme and the Faculty of Animal Husbandry Technology is not properly presented publically and is accessible in several sections of the University website (<http://www.lsmuni.lt/>). However, the information is too scattered and obscure. Essential information like the admission requirements, study plan and the descriptions of the subjects are in different sections that can mislead interested people. For example, according to the self-evaluation report (SER, page 10, point 42) “official information about the programme, its aims and mode of studies are presented on the LUHS website” and the links are given, but they are broken. What is more, at the LUHS website the information about Animal Resources Management study programme is only in Lithuanian language and not in English. On the other hand, the LUHS information database (https://sis.lsmuni.lt/visiems/Visiems/dalyku_paieska.aspx) is working correctly; the descriptions of the subjects are given in both languages.

The evaluation team does not see any particular problems according to the academic or professional requirements for the programme. In our competitive and internationalized environment, according to SER, HE graduates must have the knowledge and skills required to compete with peers not only in their own country but also internationally. An even stronger research focus might be advisable to distinguish this programme from other Master programs in this sector. We were ensured by graduates and stakeholders that there is a need for graduates of this programme in the labour market. The high percentage of graduates of 2013 (11 graduates, 5 of 7 who responded are in work) who are working in the field is supporting this information.

The evaluation team does agree with the statement made in the SER (point 44) – “Program’s name it’s not well understandable for social partners”. The name of the programme is misleading, the title does not describe the content and this is the case for the original Lithuanian title and also for the English translation. The experts group suggests that Study Programme Committee should consider renaming the programme in order to better reflect the content of the programme.

2. Curriculum design

The Master study programme has been prepared according to the requirements of the description of general requirements for Master study programmes provided by the Lithuanian Ministry of Education and Science, 2010) and is in accordance with the Bologna requirements, with no less than 90 and no more than 120 ECTS credits for the 4 semesters. The study programme’s volume – 120 credits - is correct when credits comprise 26.7 conventional hours of students’ work (in lecture halls, laboratories, independent work, etc.) The content of the programme reflects the latest achievements in science and technologies sufficiently especially the fields of genetics and animal welfare which became more important recently are well presented in the programme. However, the group acknowledges that it is practically impossible to involve the latest achievements instantly. According to this criterion there are no major concerns.

In general, the programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with efforts and teaching in a Master’s course and in comparison with similar courses abroad know to members of the team.

The curriculum (teaching load) seems to be almost equally divided between the 4 semesters; students and staff did not report any problems with the work-load. A variety of electives (number of 10: Biotechnology in animal husbandry, Good manufacturing practice in feedstuff production, Influence of Nutrition towards the Prevention of Animal Diseases, Innovative Technologies of Milk Secondary Raw Materials, Recycling and utilisation of animal origin by-products and waste, Production of Ecological Products and Hazards, Management of Business Projects, Total Quality Management, HACCP in food factories, Economic-social development of rural) can be chosen by the students, this provides the programme with more flexibility for student needs according to their background and orientations; however, for such a small number of students (admission 2011: 14 students, 2012 5 Students, 2013: 0 Student) it is questionable if this is sustainable. The table with subjects but also the meeting with teachers and students made clear that the teaching is not or only in very few cases repetitive (which students thought was helpful in those cases).

The study themes of the taught subjects are coordinated with the learning outcomes and they appear sufficiently aligned to achieve the results. In general scope and teaching methods are suitable to complete the programme successfully. The SER describes numerous teaching methods such as interactive lectures, seminars, practical classes, participating in discussions and various others. There are however some doubts whether teaching staff are actually using all of these methods as the number of students is very low at the moment (5 which were admitted in 2012). The term “interactive lecture” used in the SER should be deleted as it is inaccurate and could not be explained by the teaching staff. Further, it is debatable if lectures are appropriate for a group of less than 20 students or if other forms of knowledge transfer are more suitable for small group teaching.

During the meeting with teachers and students it became obvious that the self-studying time is not directed, there are obviously no guidelines for the students what and how they should study. We recommend giving guidelines to the students and developing online learning tools for them. The group, however, acknowledges that the development of such tools will take some time and they can be gradually implemented.

The feedback mechanisms, the supervision and quality assurance of practical work outside the University needs to be addressed. Discussion with the teachers and students did show that such placements are very variable. The current practice that students doing practical training at enterprises are only supervised by staff of these firms should be improved. The quality of

this teaching have to be co-supervised by the University (teachers), it might be advisable to formalize this with the enterprises. Guidelines for the enterprises might be helpful.

A major concern is that the visit gave evidence that it is difficult, or almost impossible, for students to use exchange programs like ERASMUS as they have to catch up after they have returned. This is strictly against the idea behind ERASMUS and must be changed.

What is more, there is a need for introducing the teaching of at least a few courses in English language, and the students should be required to have some knowledge of this language. It might be worth even considering whether reasonable competence in English should be a requirement for admission to the programme, because graduates should be able to have access and to use international bibliographies and scientific papers without dictionary and be able to access information outside the Lithuanian language. These issues were actually stressed also by the students in the interviews and teaching staff also. In general, a broader European dimension needs to be given to this programme.

3. Staff

The academic staff engaged in the second level study programme conforms to the general requirements for Master's study programmes (Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania On the Approval of the Description of General Requirements for Master Study Programmes, 3 June, 2010), requiring that at least 80% of the teachers have an academic degree (SER page.19, point20, 63) "Currently, (2012–2013 year) – 42 teachers work in the Programme (out of them – 39 doctors of sciences, 15 – professors, 17 – associated professors, 7 – lecturers; 2 study field subjects are delivered by teachers holding no science degree; 1 study subject is delivered by a teacher–assistant". Given the low number of students, the number of teaching staff is uncommonly high which allows small group teaching and one to one teaching. The turnover of teachers is rather low the majority of the teacher is employed at the university for several years. This has advantages (continuous development of teaching and research) but also disadvantages (lack of new impulses from incoming new staff)

The scientific qualification of the staff is more than sufficient, the majority of the staff members is experienced in research and teaching. The scientific output is substantial (e.g. from 2011 to 2013, 110 Scientific paper in ISI Web of Science) also the contributing to books

and non-scientific/practice publications. The fields of research of the teachers are closely related to the programme content.

The excellent staff – student relations is one of the strengths of the programme and, according to the students, the teachers are accessible for the students. Further, the group positively evaluated the efforts made by the University and teachers to ensure high pedagogic quality of the teaching.

Whilst at work, teachers are asked to enhance their professional qualifications in accordance with the order for assurance of teachers' educational competence of Lithuanian university of health sciences (approved by LUHS Senate decree No. 5-07; Jan 21, 2011).

During the discussion with the teachers, the evaluation team found that there are different ideas about the specific quality and content of this Master programme. A group of teachers showed high commitment to modern subjects which are specific for this programme (e.g. Genetics, Animal Welfare, Environmental Problems) while others seem to be more focused on traditional Animal Husbandry subjects like Nutrition/Feeding. Some teachers did not show a clear commitment to the programme, expressing that they did not feel responsible for improving attractiveness of the programme to increase the number of students. Efforts are necessary to improve alignment and coherence among the teaching staff.

There is a major concern about the insufficiently developed knowledge and skills of foreign languages (English) among the researchers/teachers. Another serious problem is the very limited mobility of staff though with a few exceptions (e.g. from 2011 to 2013 only 7 teachers went to foreign Universities). This is clearly problematic since English is the dominating language in science and decreases the international visibility of the research. The evaluation team were told that possibilities for teachers to improve their language competence and international visibility had been put in place recently, specifically the University provides grants for teachers who wish to attend conferences and universities abroad. More efforts should be made that teachers are using such possibilities. Further, the attendance of international conferences abroad should be encouraged which could lead to closer partnerships and staff exchanges with other European and international universities and research centers. Motivation for language competences should be encouraged strongly.

4. Facilities and learning resources

The self-evaluation report provided comprehensive information about the facilities (lecture hall, class rooms, library, laboratories, and computer rooms). It has been noticed as a positive fact that new facilities are under planning and the University consider it as important to update the current.

The branch library on the campus offers sufficient study space in the reading rooms. There is a decent number of computers (86 computerized desks) installed and Wifi is available for students who bring their own laptop. There are a number of textbooks and scientific journals in Lithuanian and foreign language available (648 thousand units). Given the current small number of students the number was considered to be absolutely sufficient by the students; however, it might become necessary to increase the number of copies and titles when the number of students increases. We do not necessarily think that it is a disadvantage to have only a small number of Lithuanian textbooks available, which is typical for small languages. This may even encourage students to improve their skills in English or in other foreign languages. The library subscribes to a number of databases (47 databases e.g. Biomed Central, BMJ Journals, EBSCO, Kluwers, OVID and others) which enables researches, teachers and students to have access to the majority of the international literature of the field. It might be an option to install a few smaller rooms at the library where students can do independent group work.

The laboratories we have been shown (genetic, meat hygiene, poultry nutrition) were very well equipped. The conditions for teaching and research in these facilities are very positively evaluated.

The class-rooms (computer rooms, milking technology, and anatomy) were also very well equipped and can be considered to meet the demands for high quality teaching.

During the meetings with staff and students it was almost exclusively expressed that the facilities are well used and that the working environment is very stimulating.

Summarizing, the evaluation team acknowledges the efforts that has been made to provide state of the art facilities for research and teaching and encourages the University to continue doing so.

Unfortunately, the time period allowed for the evaluation of this course did not allow the expert team to visit the farm animal practical resource units.

It is noted from the Self-Evaluation Report that whilst at present there is a significant farm of 750 ha available to provide the practical elements of the course the university is actively pursuing a strategy to further develop this. The building of an experimental farm for 500 cows with funding from an external company will certainly help at a time in Europe when milk quotas are coming to an end and dairy farming is seen as an area for expansion.

Other areas of the course, particularly pigs, sheep, beef and horses also need investment. However, care must be taken that practical resources to provide education in these commercial areas of farming meets the minimum standards required to ensure the quality of education in these areas of the course. It may be possible that the industry link developed can be replicated with other companies representing the industries of these other species.

Certain modules of the course also require the use of native Lithuanian breeds to use as examples in the preservation of Genetic material. This is adequately resourced by the Centre for the Preservation of Genetic Resources with their stock of ancient type cattle, Žemaitukai horses, Lithuanian white pigs, coarse wooled sheep and local geese.

It is essential that the agreements with farm enterprises being initiated to develop students practical skills is brought to a successful and rapid conclusion so that the incredibly valuable resource of local industries and farmers is fully utilised to educate students.

As Master study programme of Animal Resources Management also includes a wide variety of non farm animals, any practical resources needed for this section of the course must be adequately resourced. Due to the small number of students on this MA programme it is unrealistic to expect the university to invest heavily in this area, but practical facilities within the relevant industries must be sourced and agreements developed to ensure that this section of the course is adequately resourced.

5. Study process and student assessment

The admission in LUHS is organised according to the Education and Science Ministry, which approves general requirements for Master's study programmes. Admission rules are clear and easily understandable, it is carried out according to LUHS rules for students' admission approved by the Senate. No entrance examination is required. The competitive score is formed as follows: arithmetic average of overall grade average of the diploma transcript of records and evaluation of bachelor's thesis + the evaluation sum of research activity (up to 2 scores).

Since all students have to fulfil the requirement to write a Master thesis, they have to participate in research activities. As the group understood from the meetings, the topics are either allocated to the students by teachers or suggested by the students to the teachers. The team had the chance to evaluate the Master theses. The topics of the graduates were not specific to the programme content and the group could not see any difference of the topics compared with Animal husbandry topics. The quality of the theses the group was presented with was low in many respects. Some critical points were: the lack of statistical analyses, some of these were simply descriptive, hypotheses had not been formulated, the topic and amount of research was not specific to the programme, the low number of scientific citations and the extensive use of non-scientific sources like Wikipedia. This was in contrast to the high marks that had been given. Measures have to be set to ensure that the thesis meet the Bologna levels.

Students told the evaluation team that they are asked for feedback on every course. The Faculty utilises the university study information system to obtain regular feedback about the organisation of studies. Students and alumni felt that the results of surveys are taken into account in improvement of activities and told the evaluation team that they had noticed changes in the way that some teachers taught after the surveys.

In the period of 2011– 2013 year the programme's students did not leave for ERASMUS or other exchange programs. According to SER, that was caused by the following subjective reasons: employed students cannot leave their work places; not sufficient knowledge of foreign languages; lack of confidence, etc. (SER 123). The students however added that the curriculum did not allow longer stays abroad. This must be improved during the coming years and students should be encouraged to use ERASMUS since international contacts are of vital importance in scientific world. The curriculum must allow students to go abroad to study for a certain time without having to repeat the study at the University after returning.

In this context measures should be taken to ensure a general language competence of all students. During the meetings we met students who spoke fluent English but also students with no English skills at all.

All students are provided with academic or social support according to the Law on Higher Education and Research (30 April 2009 No XI-242). Students have the possibility to live in dormitories, to get scholarships and can participate in Student Scientific Society activity or events A number of social activities (e.g. choir, music, dance, scientific and sports groups)

are available to the students who gave a very positive feedback on this topic during the meeting

The State Studies Foundation is a state budgetary institution, which administers financial support for students. The main functions are administering state-supported loans to students, social grants to students of schools of higher education studying at the first, second or continuous study levels.

6. Programme management

A major concern is the low attractiveness of the programme; it is an alarming sign that the programme that has founded just recently does not attract a single student. Such a development generates questions about the overall viability of the programme. A discussion about the causes must be started immediately.

The efficiency of marketing and promoting the programme has to be improved dramatically since without recruiting students the viability of the programme is questionable. Further, sources for funding for students need to be explored; it might be advisable to start with a continuous track as in other Master programmes.

The profile of the programme must be sharpened; it should be distinct and recognizable. A focus on new breeding techniques, genetic methods, sustainable production and environmental topics is encouraged.

As it is a relatively new programme, there is only limited data (just 1 year of graduates) available for evaluation. It seems that there have been already changes as it is stated in the SER that “The committee for study programme of Animal Husbandry, Animal Resources Management has started activity since February, 2013 which is long after the programme had started. Before February 2013, faculty dean was responsible for the control)” (point 146). The group agrees that a collegial body is of importance and has major advantages over a one-person leadership to improve the internal quality assurance.

Student and graduate feedback should be used more extensively in the future and should have major impact on the programme. The involvement of stakeholders from governmental bodies but especially from industry seems to be rather less developed. The contact to the stakeholders is based on personal contact between the university teachers and representatives of industry or governmental bodies. To our knowledge no formal internal or external evaluations of the programme had been performed yet.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are supposed to help the faculty improving the programme.

1. The viability of the programme must be discussed; it is an alarming sign that the programme that has started just recently does not attract a single student. Sharpen the profile of the programme, strengthen the genuine parts of the programme, make it distinct and recognizable.
2. Consider improvement of marketing and promoting the programme as well as funding possibilities for students; discuss if it would be advisable to offer a continuous track of the Master programme to attract senior students.
3. Improve the topics and quality of the theses, define higher standards.
4. Ensure coherent views and ideas in the programme among all staff members.
5. Ensure the mobility of students and teachers.
6. Improve the use of students, graduates and stakeholders (social partners) feedback; formalize the influence of these stakeholders in the programme.
7. Measures should be taken to improve the passive and active English knowledge of staff and students to improve internationality.
8. Think about a change in the name of the programme title, which describes the content of the programme more appropriately.

IV. SUMMARY

The facilities which were visited demonstrated that the university has a very good structure of laboratories, libraries and other student teaching facilities. The group was ensured that continuous investment in key areas will ensure that quality education in both lectures and practicals continues to be developed.

The programme was positively evaluated by students, graduates and stakeholders and there is a demand for graduates of the programme. The rate of employment of the 2103 graduates was sufficient.

From the meetings with teachers and students it was apparent that the teachers are very approachable to students and willing to give their time to students outside the formal taught

lectures and practicals. The teachers also took part in continuous professional development both in the academic and pedagogic areas.

The result of good teachers and facilities, coupled with an industry that is willing to employ nearly all graduates from the course has resulted in a high level of satisfaction amongst the interviewed graduates and Alumni.

Despite the positive opinion of all involved parties the programme has a very low attractiveness to future students although there are objective (funding) backgrounds for this development. There is an insufficient efficiency of marketing/promotion of the programme. Strategies must therefore be developed to address the perceived lack of attractiveness of the course.

There is a considerable lack of coherent ideas on the programme among the staff.

The Master theses which were presented were not specific to the programme content; their scientific quality was generally low.

There is a considerable lack of international visibility and of teachers and students mobility. This will entail ensuring that the language skills of all concerned continue to develop, that visits abroad are encouraged for all concerned and that the visit is not to their detriment on return to Kaunas.

A more coherent and integrated structure of course management needs to be introduced so that in future the aims and objectives of the course are clear, responsibility for overall management of the programme is clearly identified and the module structures, particularly with reference to the practical content of the subjects for the continuous study students is reviewed.

The evaluation team hopes that this balanced report is useful in assisting the university to further development of this course in a way which will help the agricultural industry of Lithuania to provide workers and experts who will fully participate in the European market.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Animal resources management* (state code – 621D91001) at Lithuanian University of Health Sciences is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by fields of assessment.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Staff	3
4.	Material resources	4
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	2
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	2
	Total:	17

*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. Ulf Magnusson

Michael Pearson

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. Dr. Thomas Wittek

Gediminas Vagonis

Inga Kalpakovaitė

**LIETUVOS SVEIKATOS MOKSLŲ UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS GYVŪNINIŲ IŠTEKLIŲ VALDYMAS (VALSTYBINIS
KODAS – 621D91001) 2014-05-02 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-
199 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Lietuvos sveikatos mokslų universiteto studijų programa *Gyvūninių išteklių valdymas* (valstybinis kodas – 621D91001) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	4
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	17

* 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

Apsilankiusi universitete vertinimo grupė įsitikino, kad jis turi labai gerai išplėtotą infrastruktūrą: laboratorijas, bibliotekas ir kitas studijoms skirtas patalpas bei įrenginius.

Grupė buvo patikinta, kad nuolat skiriama lėšų pagrindinėms sritims, tad užtikrinamas nenutrūkstamas paskaitų ir praktinių užsiėmimų kokybės gerinimas.

Studentai, absolventai ir socialiniai dalininkai teigiamai įvertino šią programą; jos absolventai turi paklausą darbo rinkoje. 2013 m. absolventų užimtumo lygis buvo pakankamas.

Per susitikimus su dėstytojais ir studentais paaiškėjo, kad dėstytojai yra labai prieinami studentams, nes yra pasirengę skirti jiems savo laiką – ir ne tik per oficialias paskaitas bei praktinius užsiėmimus. Dėstytojai nuolat tobulino savo profesinę – akademinę ir pedagoginę – kvalifikaciją.

Dėl gerų dėstytojų ir materialiujų išteklių, aptariamo sektoriaus, kuris pasirengęs įdarbinti beveik visus šios programos absolventus, visi apklaustieji absolventai ir buvę studentai išreiškė didelį pasitenkinimą.

Nepaisant teigiamos visų susijusių šalių nuomonės, ši programa pritraukia labai nedaug naujų studentų, nors yra objektyvus pagrindas (finansavimas) jai plėtoti. Šios programos rinkodara ir (arba) reklama nepakankamai veiksminga. Todėl būtina parengti strategiją, kaip padidinti programos patrauklumą.

Darbuotojams labai trūksta vienodo požiūrio į programą.

Magistrantūros baigiamieji darbai, kurie buvo pateikti, neatspindėjo programos turinio; apskritai jie buvo žemos mokslinės kokybės.

Programos tarptautinio žinomumo ir dėstytojų bei studentų judumo lygis nepakankamas. Todėl reikia užtikrinti, kad būtų toliau gerinami visų susijusių asmenų užsienio kalbų įgūdžiai, skatinami vizitai visų norinčiųjų išvykti į užsienį ir kad išvykimas nebūtų jiems nuostolingas grįžus į Kauną.

Būtina diegti darnesnę ir integralesnę programos vadybos struktūrą, kad ateityje būtų aiškiai nustatyti programos tikslai bei uždaviniai ir atsakomybė už bendrą programos vadybą, peržiūrėta modulių struktūra, ypač praktinis dalykų turinys ištisinių studijų studentams.

Vertinimo grupė tikisi, kad šios subalansuotos vertinimo išvados padės universitetui toliau tobulinti programą ir aprūpinti Lietuvos žemės ūkio sektorių darbuotojais bei ekspertais, kurie įsilies į Europos rinką.

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

Manoma, kad šios rekomendacijos padės fakultetui patobulinti programą Gyvūninių išteklių valdymas.

1. Būtina apsvarstyti šios programos įgyvendinamumo klausimą; tai, kad visai neseniai pradėta įgyvendinti programa nepritraukia nė vieno studento, yra nerimą keliantis ženklas. Rekomenduojama gerinti programos žinomumą, stiprinti autentiškąsias jos dalis, padaryti ją savitą ir atpažįstamą.
2. Apsvarstyti programos rinkodaros ir reklamos gerinimo, studentų finansavimo galimybes; aptarti, ar, siekiant pritraukti paskutiniojo kurso studentų, būtų tikslinga siūlyti iššestines magistrantūros programos studijas.
3. Gerinti baigiamųjų darbų temas ir kokybę, nustatyti griežtesnius reikalavimus.
4. Užtikrinti, kad visų dėstytojų požiūriai ir idėjos programos atžvilgiu nesiskirtų.
5. Užtikrinti studentų ir dėstytojų judumą.
6. Daugiau remtis studentų, absolventų ir socialinių dalininkų (socialinių partnerių) grįžtamuju ryšiu; įforminti šių socialinių dalininkų poveikį programai.
7. Reikėtų imtis priemonių dėstytojų ir studentų pasyviai bei aktyviai anglų kalbos mokėjimui gerinti siekiant didinti programos tarptautiškumą.
8. Apsvarstyti programos pavadinimo keitimo klausimą, kad būtų tinkamiau atspindimas programos turinys.

<...>

Paslaugos teikėja patvirtina, jog yra susipažinusi su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso¹ 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)

¹ Žin., 2002, Nr.37-1341.