STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

ALEKSANDRO STULGINSKIO UNIVERSITETO
(aukštosios mokyklos pavadinimas)
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS "*AGRONOMIJA*"
(valstybinis kodas – 6121IX004, 612D72001)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF "*AGRONOMY*" (*state code – 6121IX004, 612D72001*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at ALEKSANDRAS STULGINSKIS UNIVERSITY
(higher education institution)

Review' team:

1. **Prof. Dr. Ioannis Vlahos (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. dr. Helena Korpelainen,** *academic,*
3. **Mr. Kevin Kendall,** *academic,*
4. **Ms. Alina Adomaitytė,** *representative of social partners'*
5. **Mr. Gabrielius Jakutis,** *students' representative*.

Evaluation coordinator -

Ms. Natalja Bogdanova

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	*Agronomija*
Valstybinis kodas	6121IX004, 612D72001
Studijų sritis	Biomedicinos mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Žemės ūkio mokslai
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji (bakalauro)
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė – 4 metai, ištęstinė – 6 metai
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Agronomijos bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2009.08.31

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	*Agronomy*
State code	6121IX004, 612D72001
Study area	Biomedical Sciences
Study field	Agricultural Sciences
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First (Bachelor)
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time – 4 years, part-time – 6 years
Volume of the study programme in credits	240 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Agronomy
Date of registration of the study programme	31.08.2009

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2. General

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

No.	Name of the document
1	Study Programme Management Committees

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

Aleksandras Stulginskis University is managed by the Rector under the governance of the University Council and the Senate. The University has autonomy in its academic, administrative, economic and financial management activities and is governed according to the Bologna Process and the Constitution, Law and Resolutions of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania.

The University has started a programme of updating its facilities and rationalising its structure. It currently comprises five faculties offering higher education in biomedical, technological and social sciences, and the programme belongs to the Faculty of Agronomy. The Faculty of Agronomy delivers 5 first cycle programmes, 5 second cycle programmes and third cycle (doctoral) studies.

The University is the only one in Lithuania that offers higher education in land based subjects. The Bachelor programme in Agronomy was registered initially in 2009 and offered as a 4 year full time or 6 year part time programme comprising 240 ECTS credits. It was subsequently given a positive evaluation by SKVC in 2011 and accredited for further 6 years until 30 June 2017. The Self-evaluation report (SER) was written between November 2016 and January 2017 by a group of six people including Associate professors, a lecturer and a student. It contains data from the academic years 2011 to 2016, and was considered at the meeting of the Board of the Faculty of Agronomy on 25 January 2017. The SER states that in 2015/16 there were 7 Professors, 29 Associate Professors, 14 Lecturers and 2 Assistants teaching on the programme which had 129 new students admitted in 2015/16, 163 in 2014/15, 110 in 2013/14 and 83 in 2012/13.

Evidence relating to the Programme aims and outcomes, curriculum design, staff, facilities and learning resources, student process and student assessment and programme management were submitted for evaluation. The review team examined documents relating to these areas, held meetings with senior staff and faculty administration staff, the Self Evaluation Sub Group, teaching staff, students, alumni, and employers and social partners. The grades awarded through this process are stated at the end of this report along with strengths and recommendations for improvement.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. V-41 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 4th April 2017.

1. **Prof. dr. Ioannis Vlahos (team leader),** *Professor Emeritus of Technological Educational Institute of Crete, Bologna expert at the Hellenic Ministry of Education, Greece.*
2. **Prof. dr. Helena Korpelainen,** *Head of the Department of Agricultural Sciences, Agribusiness, University of Helsinki, Finland.*
3. **Mr. Kevin Kendall,** *Educational Consultant, Director of RKK LTD., England.*
4. **Ms. Alina Adomaitytė,** *Managing Director at JSC Innoera, Lithuania.*
5. **Mr. Gabrielius Jakutis,** *Student of Vilnius University Faculty of Medicine, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

Agronomy is a very wide subject and the Programme successfully addresses this with an all-encompassing aim. The main aim of the Programme as stated in the SER is *'to prepare competent, high erudition bachelors in Agronomy, who will have knowledge in the branch of agronomy and related sciences, will be able to use agricultural resources rationally, to consult in crop development, productivity and quality formation or improvement and agroecology issues'*. Agriculture is a multidisciplinary subject which is constantly developing using new technologies and has to adapt to changing market requirements as well as environmental issues. The University is aware that there is a need for specialists in this area and this was confirmed by the employers who met the review team. The SER states that the main factors which determine the need for specialists in the sector are the rapid development of the sector, a need to increase efficiency and a reducing number of people available due to the demographic trend. This means that the majority of graduates find employment in the sector. The University has completed some surveys of employers to gain feedback on the need for the Programme, has excellent personal relationships with individual employers, but has no ongoing formal mechanism to gather data from employers (see chapter 2.6). A more formal mechanism could result in further refinement of the programme aims and objectives to ensure that they continue to meet employer and societal needs. The annual survey of graduates on average that 87% of respondents find employment related to the subject studied, mainly in Lithuania.

The Programme Aims, Objectives and Learning Outcomes are appropriate to a first cycle programme and are linked to the mission, objectives and strategy of the University. Details of the University mission, vision and strategy are published on the website [https://asu.lt/language/en/] along with the Programme Aims, Objectives and Learning Outcomes. A summary of the aims and outcomes is also available on the Open Information, Counselling and Guidance (AIKOS) system which publishes relevant information on learning opportunities in Lithuanian and is used by potential students.

The Programme comprises 53 Study Subjects or Courses which together fulfil the aims of the Programme. Each one has a course objective which is mapped to the main and secondary objectives of the Programme which relate to knowledge and its application, special abilities, scientific research abilities, social abilities and personal abilities. The course descriptions also show how the assessment criteria, learning methods and course learning outcomes are linked to the Programme Learning Outcomes. This mapping is very clear on paper though is quite complex and would be difficult to ensure that a student achieves all the relevant learning outcomes through

assessment. It also does not show a clear progression through each year of the Programme but students confirmed that the Programme does get more challenging and specialist as they progress through it.

The University has responded to the previous evaluation by including some animal production but as the Programme title is Bachelor of Agronomy, this is sufficient and the range of current subjects are appropriate for the title and award. However both employers, students and the SER state that graduates may lack practical skills. This Programme is at Bachelor level so needs to be of an academic nature, and although students develop practical skills during laboratory work and traineeships, there may be scope for increasing the time that students spend on professional practice throughout the Programme as stated during both student and employer meetings with the review team.

Strengths

1. Objectives and learning outcomes are appropriate for the industry and are linked to the mission, objectives and strategy of the university.
2. The University and individual staff have strong links with and support of employers.
3. There is a high demand for graduates and there are good employability prospects.

Weaknesses

1. There is a need to improve the level of practical skills gained in the programme.

2.2. Curriculum design

This is a 4 year full time or 6 year part time Bachelor of Agronomy Programme which comprises 240 ECTS credits and is in line with legislative requirements including the *Description of General Guidelines for First Cycle and Integrated Degree Study Programmes* of the Minister of Education and Science and the *Description of the Arrangement of Study Programmes of the Lithuanian University of Agriculture according to ECTS Requirements.*

The Programme consists of a wide spread of subjects which are appropriate to the degree title, are professionally relevant and consistent with a first cycle programme. Student and employers confirm that both general and specialist subjects were needed by graduates and the Programme also gives students the opportunity to specialise in subjects of their choice, for example, Floriculture or Applied Biotechnology, which are consistent with the Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes..

The subjects and study methods as stated in the course descriptions enable the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Subjects are relevant at the moment but it is important that they

maintain their currency and that there is a method of ensuring that they are kept up to date with new developments in this rapidly evolving sector.

This is a well-planned programme comprising 53 subjects of between 3 and 8 credits, with the final thesis being worth 12 credits. Students confirm that the spread of subjects is appropriate for their needs, gets increasingly challenging as they progress through the Programme and allows them to specialise in later years. Each credit comprises to 26.7 hours of study and 60 credits are studied per year on a full time basis which corresponds to 1600 hours of study per year. In the case of part time study it is 40 credits per year or 1068 hours of study. The Programme plans give a breakdown of these hours between contact time and private study and whether it is, for example, lecture, practical, laboratory work, seminars or examinations.

Full time students go on professional practice after the completion of the spring semester of year 3, and part time students after the spring semester of year 5. This is formally arranged between the University, the student and the placement provider and the student has to complete a practice report. Students and alumni reported that they would like this period to be extended and to take place earlier in the Programme.

The final thesis is an important part of the Programme and comprises independent work of an experimental nature encompassing current research in the area. Topics chosen by students, with the support of teaching staff are in the core field of agronomy and the student must be able to demonstrate the ability to formulate problems, conduct a literature review and research, assess results, formulate conclusions and defend their work. The review team concluded that the thesis submissions seen met the above criteria and were appropriate for the Programme. However the theses seen by the review team are all written in Lithuanian and to a large extent use Lithuanian references. This reflects the need to further internationalise the curriculum and use research papers in English.

Strengths

1. Broad based curriculum which also enables students to specialise.
2. Quality of work undertaken by students in their final theses.

Weaknesses

1. Students need more professional practice/experience.
2. Internationalisation of the curriculum/research papers in English could be considered.

2.3. Teaching staff

There are 52 teachers who teach on this agronomy programme, including 7 professors, 29 associate professors, 14 researchers and 2 assistants. These academic staff meet the general requirements set for first cycle study programmes, namely the *General Requirements for First Cycle Study Programmes and Integrated University Study Programmes,* approved by the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania. Although over 80% of teachers are from the Faculty of Agronomy, teachers from across all the Faculties of the University teach on the Programme as well. The average age of the teachers on the programme is 45 years, and of the professors 55 years, most of whom are from Lithuania and many have also been students at the University. There is therefore a need to ensure that in the future a greater range of experience and expertise is brought into the Faculty.

The list of lecturers supplied to the team showing their teaching subjects and teaching, scientific and practical experience indicate that their qualifications and experience is more than appropriate to the learning outcomes of the Programme but the level of English speaking among teaching staff is low, and this compounds the difficulty of internationalising the curriculum and enabling students to be prepared for employment in the modern world, and both to utilise research and new ideas from outside the country and to facilitate employment outside Lithuania. However it is recognised that the University is taking steps to address this and in recent years teaching staff have attended training abroad in a number of other European countries. The SER states that there are many opportunities for staff development both in Lithuania and in other countries, however not all teachers participate in this. The SER states that teachers' qualifications are evaluated every 5 years during the personal appraisal session, and although there is an assessment of staff work at the start of each academic year, it would be more usual for appraisals to happen annually to ensure currency of knowledge and skills. Students also stated that some staff could be more up to date with their knowledge and some do not use the University's virtual learning environment in their teaching.

Students are instructed to complete course questionnaires at the end of every module which both evaluates the subject learnt and the quality of the teaching which is good practice although inconsistently implemented (see chapter 2.6). There is no formal method of evaluating the quality of teaching other than by course questionnaires completed by students at the end of each course, but students are generally satisfied with their teaching, learning and assessment and very satisfied with the level of support given by teaching staff. There are very good staff student relationships and students complimented teaching staff on both the support given during planned contact time and also through personal consultations outside of this time.

Strengths

1. Good staff student relationships.
2. Good system of feedback from students for course evaluation.
3. Students are very satisfied with the teaching, learning and assessment.

Weaknesses

1. Lack of English understanding and speaking in teaching staff which restricts international relations.
2. Some teachers' knowledge is not current and some do not use the virtual learning environment.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

Since the previous evaluation in 2011, the University has conducted infrastructure improvement works comprising replacing windows and repair work, purchasing new furniture and equipment and installing internet access. New and updated resources includes a range of laboratory equipment for studies in soil and plant science are now appropriate to the subjects studied. New computer rooms have also been provided with internet access and appropriate specialised software installed for both technical subjects and for evaluating data from the final theses.

The University also has an Experimental Station, Learning Farm and Pomological Garden, including renovated laboratories with modern equipment to provide practical study and research skills for students. These are useful resources but it is important to keep up with the demands of industry. Although it is difficult for a University farm to reflect all the industries in the region, consideration should be given to other important areas, for example, intensive vegetable production or commercial glasshouse production.

Students have the opportunity to spend some of their time either working, studying or carrying out research projects at partner institutions, for example, the Lithuanian Research Centre for Agriculture and Forestry and the Kaunas Botanical Garden. Their professional practice is undertaken at placements in companies and farms or in an ERASMUS programme abroad. Some students found these experiences very valuable and thought that this was an area that the University could extend to increase their application of knowledge gained in the University in a practical and professional context. Employers were also supportive of extending the opportunity for students to undertake professional practice.

The University has also recently reconstructed the library, which includes reading rooms with 154 places. The SER states that on 1 January 2015, the library had 157,260 titles, 159 printed

periodicals and students and staff had access to 22,000 scientific journals. This all is appropriate for the Agronomy programme but the use of international references is governed by the ability to understand English, many of the references cited in the subject descriptions are in Lithuanian.

Strengths

1. New and updated equipment is appropriate to the Programme.

Weaknesses

1. Ensure that the University farm resources reflects the production in the region.
2. Extend the opportunity for students to undertake professional practice.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

To gain admission to the Bachelor in Agronomy programme applicants must have undergone secondary education to a satisfactory level according to the *Rules of Admission to First Cycle (Bachelor's) Study Programmes of Aleksandras Stulginskis University*. Appeals against admission decisions are examined by the Commission for Appeals for Admissions but the SER states that no appeals have been filed during the years in question.

The number of applicants to the Programme has generally increased over the last 6 years from 378 in 2011/12 to 556 in 2015/16. This has also resulted in an increase in students admitted from 73 in 2011/12 to 129 in 2015/16. During the same period retention has varied between 64% and 92% for full time students and 70% and 96% for part time students. This is excellent for part time students particularly as this is over a 6 year period but the reasons for the variation in non-completion by full time students needs further investigation.

The Programme schedule is drawn up for the term and published to staff and students, 4 weeks at the end of term being scheduled for examinations. Students confirmed that the timing of lessons and assessments were planned in advance and appropriate for the subject. The assessments are well planned with each subject description stating the assessment type and the weighting of each part, as well as the timing of each part, although the number of learning outcomes across all the subjects could lead to over assessment but the students talked to did not raise this as an issue. They also stated that the assessments used are relevant, accurate and fair.

The review team concluded that the organisation of the study process ensures proper implementation of the Programme giving students the opportunity to achieve the intended Learning Outcomes. The timetable enables students to take part in seminars, discussions and scientific and practical activities that are relevant to the programme in a fair and supportive learning environment.

Students also reported that they found the programme challenging, particularly in later years, and welcomed the opportunity to specialise depending on their interests. They said that the teachers were very helpful and supportive but not always use the virtual learning environment to support their teaching. They also mentioned that sometimes the teachers' ability to communicate in English was a limiting factor in their studies.

Students present the findings in their theses at an annual scientific student conference and more practice at doing this during the programme would be useful. Employers and alumni stated that the communication and presentations skills of students could be improved and more opportunities to do this in the Programme would be desirable.

During the year 2011 to 2016, 25 agronomy students studied in foreign universities as part of an ERASMUS programme, which is very valuable, but only a small percentage of students participate (<15%). Those that did participate found it very valuable particularly in their personal development.

Students reported that the support they receive before enrolling on the Programme, during induction, on programme and in careers advice is very good. They are also aware of the complaints and appeals procedures although none of the students the review team concluded that talked to had used them.

Strengths

1. Students find the Programme interesting and feel challenged with their studies.
2. Good students support throughout the Programme.
3. Assessments are relevant, accurate, and fair.

Weaknesses

1. Communication and presentation skills of students as well as participation in ERASMUS.

2.6. Programme management

The University allocates responsibility for Programme management at the Faculty level to the Faculty Dean and the study programme committees. Administration of admissions, timetabling, examinations and data is the responsibility of the Faculty Deans Office. The review team met a large number of staff from the University concerned with the Programme but it was not clear to the team who had operational responsibility for managing the Programme. It was also not clear to students when asked by the review team who was responsible for the Programme, although they agreed that the University was receptive to their comments. According to the SER, the chairman of

the Programme Committee has responsibility for the management, monitoring and quality assurance of the Programme but was not identified in the meetings with the review team. Each student group also has a representative who is able to give informal feedback on student issues relevant to programme management. The review team did not see complete evidence of the quality cycle happening in practice so that identified issues are addressed and resolved.

The Programme Committee, in its internal annual assessment, submits proposals for change to the Faculty of Agronomy Council which then have to be approved by the University Senate according to the *Description of Aleksandras Stulginskis University Internal Quality Assurance System*. Every year in March/April the Programme Committee assesses data relating to admissions, examinations, employability and surveys. Internal assessment of the Programme by the University has resulted in the following recommendations: the coordination of studies schedules with the needs of students; a greater focus on practical training (addressed also by the review team, see chapter 2.1), an improvement in thesis preparation; an expansion of the subject *Animal Husbandry*; to update the list of final thesis topics every year and to increase the level of employer involvement in the Programme. Although these recommendations were approved, the review team did not find any evidence of significant progress, for example, in increasing practical training or the level of formal employer involvement in the Programme.

Although there are informal discussions between lecturers, students and employers, there are no formal methods of ensuring the curriculum is kept up to date and there is no formal mechanism to collect feedback from employers on the programme, especially regarding the programme aims and learning outcomes', as confirmed by the employer representatives that the review team met. The employers alumni who met the review team would welcome an initiative which enabled them to do this.

Students are represented on many committees in the University and are able to give feedback as necessary. At a programme level, the only formal feedback mechanism is through the course surveys which are completed electronically at the end of each course. The participation rate of students in these surveys is generally low with no students completing them in some cases. This is currently not satisfactory but would be a very useful form of feedback on courses and teachers if more fully completed. There should be consideration of having more diverse methods of gathering student feedback rather than relying on a single method with a low participation rate.

Although teaching staff are well qualified and experienced, their level of knowledge in English and participation in mobility schemes is low. This has an impact on the Programme in limiting student access to international publications and their opportunities to be involved in international activities.

Although the reporting mechanisms are in place, there is little evidence of data on recruitment, retention, success rate and employability being used in a systematic way to drive improvement, for example, what action was taken following the retention rate of 64% for students graduating in 2012 and what is the retention rate for current student groups? Annual monitoring of the programme is limited in its scope as students and employers stated that there was no formal method for them to feedback to the University at programme level. It is stated in the SER that the responsibility for quality assurance is the Vice Rector for Studies and the Centre for Study Quality and Innovation which leads to some confusion as to where the responsibility lies.

Strengths

1. Course questionnaires for students with a range of some useful questions.

Weaknesses

1. There is a lack of clarity as to who is responsible for the operational management of the Programme.
2. Lack of a formal systematic mechanism for course monitoring and evaluation using relevant data.
3. There is no formal mechanism to collect feedback from employers on the programme.
4. Student questionnaires are for courses only, have closed questions, are inconsistently completed and no evidence of actions taken were found.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Establish a formal mechanism to collect feedback from employers on the programme aims and learning outcomes.
2. Review the timing and length of the practice period to ensure graduates are prepared for employment.
3. Increase the internationalisation of the curriculum and increase the use of research papers in English.
4. Review staff recruitment and development to ensure that teaching staff are more aware of current technology and English language is more widely used.
5. Take steps through curriculum management and teaching and learning to improve the communication and presentation skills of students.
6. Ensure that the University farm resources reflects the production in the region.
7. Improve transparency in programme management to ensure that staff and students are aware of their roles and responsibilities.
8. Establish a formal systematic mechanism for course monitoring and evaluation using relevant data, to ensure the curriculum continues to be relevant.

IV. SUMMARY

The Bachelor's Degree Programme in Agronomy provides graduates with knowledge of agronomy consistent with first cycle university studies. The Programme fulfils the needs of national and regional development, labour market and employers in agronomy but the University should establish a formal mechanism to collect feedback from employers on future Programme developments. There is a large demand in the country for graduates from this programme and most students successfully gain related employment. Both employers and students state that graduates would be even better prepared for employment if they experienced more professional practice and the University should consider reviewing the timing and length of the practice period to address this issue.

The number, qualifications and experience of teaching staff are appropriate for the Programme and there are excellent staff student relations with students being very complimentary about the level of support provided by teachers. However it is important for the future that the University review staff recruitment and development to ensure that they are kept up to date with current technology and that English language is more widely used. It is also recommended that the internationalisation of the curriculum is progressed and the use of research papers in English is increased.

Knowledge gained by students on technical subjects is regarded as good by both alumni and employers but employers would like students to be better communicators. Therefore it is recommended that steps are taken through curriculum management and teaching and learning to improve the communication and presentation skills of students.

Lecture rooms, laboratories and computer classrooms are spacious and well equipped, and library collections are good. Digitalisation in studies is progressing well and the virtual learning environment is widely used, although not by all teachers. The University also has good practical resources to demonstrate production techniques but care should be taken to ensure that farm resources continue to reflect the production in the region.

There is confusion among staff and students regarding management of the Programme and it is recommended that the University improve transparency in Programme management to ensure that staff and students are aware of their roles and responsibilities. In addition, the process of gathering feedback from staff students and stakeholders is inconsistent and it is recommended that the University establish a formal systematic mechanism for course monitoring and evaluation using relevant data, to ensure the curriculum continues to be relevant.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Agronomy* (state code – 6121IX004, 612D72001) at Aleksandras Stulginskis 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	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: Ioannis Vlahos

Grupės nariai:
Team members: Helena Korpelainen

Kevin Kendall

Alina Adomaitytė

Gabrielius Jakutis

Vertimas iš anglų kalbos

ALEKSANDRO STULGINSKIO UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *AGRONOMIJA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 6121IX004) 2017-06-14 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-122 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Aleksandro Stulginskio universiteto studijų programa *Agronomija* (valstybinis kodas – 6121IX004, 612D72001) 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	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
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

Pagal bakalauro studijų programą *Agronomija* absolventams suteikiamos agronomijos žinios atitinka pirmos pakopos universitetines studijas. Studijų programa atitinka šalies ir regiono agronomijos plėtros poreikius, taip pat darbo rinkos ir darbdavių poreikius. Tačiau Universitetas turi nustatyti formalią grįžtamojo ryšio su darbdaviais sistemą, kad darbdaviai galėtų pareikšti savo nuomonę apie tolesnį studijų programos vystymą. Agronomijos specialistų poreikis šalyje yra didelis, todėl studijų programos absolventai lengvai randa darbą pagal savo profesiją. Tiek darbdaviai, tiek studentai mano, kad absolventai būtų dar geriau pasirengę darbui, jei atliktų daugiau profesinės praktikos. Todėl Universitetas turi peržiūrėti praktikos atlikimo laiką ir jos trukmę.

Dėstytojų skaičius, kvalifikacija ir patirtis tinkama studijų programai vykdyti. Dėstytojų ir studentų tarpusavio santykiai yra puikūs, ir studentai labai vertina dėstytojų teikiamą pagalbą. Tačiau ateityje Universitetas, priimdamas naujus darbuotojus ir keldamas jų kvalifikaciją, turi užtikrinti, kad dėstytojai išmanytų šiuolaikines technologijas ir dažniau vartotų anglų kalbą. Taip pat rekomenduojama didinti studijų programos sandaros tarptautiškumą ir į dalykus įtraukti daugiau mokslinių tyrimų darbų anglų kalba.

Alumnų ir darbdavių nuomone, techninių dalykų žinios, kurias įgyja studentai, yra geros, tačiau darbdaviai pageidautų, kad studentai turėtų geresnius bendravimo gebėjimus. Rekomenduojama, kad būtų peržiūrėtos dalykų programos ir mokymo bei mokymosi metodai, siekiant pagerinti studentų bendravimo ir informacijos pateikimo gebėjimus.

Auditorijos, laboratorijos ir kompiuterių klasės yra erdvios ir gerai įrengtos. Biblioteka aprūpinta tinkamais ištekliais. Vykdomas studijų skaitmeninimas ir plačiai naudojama virtuali mokymosi aplinka (deja, ja naudojasi ne visi dėstytojai). Universitetas taip pat turi tinkamus praktinius išteklius, kad studentai būtų supažindinti su gamybos technologijomis. Tačiau reikia užtikrinti, kad universitetinės fermos ištekliai labiau atspindėtų regiono žemės ūkio produkciją.

Nei dėstytojai, nei studentai neturi aiškios vizijos dėl studijų programos vadybos. Rekomenduojama didinti studijų programos vadybos skaidrumą siekiant užtikrinti, kad dėstytojai ir studentai suvoktų savo vaidmenį ir atsakomybę. Dėstytojų ir studentų bei kitų dalininkų grįžtamojo ryšio rinkimo procesas nėra nuoseklus. Reikia nustatyti formalią sistemą, pagal kurią remiantis turimais duomenimis būtų nuolatos peržiūrimas dalykų turinys ir vertinimo kriterijai siekiant užtikrinti, kad studijų turinys išliktų aktualus.

<…>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Nustatyti formalią grįžtamojo ryšio su darbdaviais sistemą, kad darbdaviai galėtų pareikšti savo nuomonę apie studijų programos tikslus ir rezultatus.
2. Peržiūrėti praktikos atlikimo laiką ir jos trukmę siekiant užtikrinti, kad absolventai būtų pasirengę darbui.
3. Didinti programos sandaros tarptautiškumą ir į dalykus įtraukti daugiau mokslinių tyrimų darbų anglų kalba.
4. Priimant naujus darbuotojus ir keliant jų kvalifikaciją užtikrinti, kad dėstytojai geriau išmanytų šiuolaikines technologijas ir dažniau vartotų anglų kalbą.

5. Gerinti studentų bendravimo ir informacijos pateikimo gebėjimus. Tam reikėtų peržiūrėti dalykų programas ir mokymo bei mokymosi metodus.
6. Užtikrinti, kad universitetinės fermos ištekliai atspindėtų regiono žemės ūkio produkciją.
7. Didinti studijų programos vadybos skaidrumą siekiant užtikrinti, kad dėstytojai ir studentai suvoktų savo vaidmenį ir atsakomybę.
8. Nustatyti formalią sistemą, pagal kurią remiantis turimais duomenimis būtų nuolatos peržiūrimas dalykų turinys ir vertinimo kriterijai siekiant užtikrinti, kad studijų turinys išliktų aktualus.

<…>

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)