



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

LIETUVOS SVEIKATOS MOKSLŲ UNIVERSITETO
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS "GYVULININKYSTĖS
TECHNOLOGIJA" (valstybinis kodas - 6121IX001)**
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

**EVALUATION REPORT
OF "ANIMAL HUSBANDRY TECHNOLOGY"
(state code - 6121IX001)
STUDY PROGRAMME**
at LITHUANIAN UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

Review' team:

- 1. Prof. dr. Thomas Wittek (team leader), *academic,***
- 2. Prof. dr. David Arney, *academic,***
- 3. Prof. dr. Piotr Nowakowski, *academic,***
- 4. Rita Naudužienė, *representative of social partners'***
- 5. Simonas Pusvaškis, *students' representative.***

Evaluation coordinator - Ms Gabrielė Bajorinaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Gyvulininkystės technologija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	6121IX001
Studijų sritis	Biomedicinos mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Gyvulininkystė
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4 m); Iššęstinė (6 m)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Žemės ūkio mokslų bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1992

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Animal Husbandry Technology</i>
State code	6121IX001
Study area	Biomedical Sciences
Study field	Animal Husbandry
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (4 years); Part time (6 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Agricultural Sciences
Date of registration of the study programme	1992

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process	4
1.2. General.....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information.....	4
1.4. The Review Team.....	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2.2. Curriculum design	6
2.3. Teaching staff	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	9
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	10
2.6. Programme management	12
2.7. Examples of excellence *	14
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	15
IV. SUMMARY.....	16
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	17

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
-	

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

The evaluation report is for the bachelor study programme in Animal Husbandry Technology at the Lithuanian University of Health Sciences. The evaluation report has been produced and agreed by the afore-mentioned team.

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 (29th/30th May 2017). The site visit included meetings with university, faculty, and department management, teachers, students, alumni and external stakeholders (social partners) as well as a tour through the on-campus teaching facilities, laboratories and the off-campus university farm.

The team acknowledge 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 influences on the evaluated study programme. However, it is beyond the scope of the team to assess these factors.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according to the *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 the HEI was conducted by the team on 29 and 30/May/2017.

- 1. Prof. Dr. hab. Thomas Wittek (team leader)**, *Professor at Vienna Veterinary University, Austria;*
- 2. Prof. Dr. David Arney**, *Professor at Estonian University of Life Sciences, Estonia;*
- 3. Prof. Dr. hab. Piotr Nowakowski**, *Professor at Wrocław University of Environmental and Life Sciences, Poland;*
- 4. Rita Naudužienė**, *Deputy Director at JSC "Animal Productivity Control", Lithuania;*
- 5. Simonas Pusvaškis**, *Graduate of Master Programme Applied Economics at Aleksandras Stulginskis University, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The learning outcomes are considered appropriate for the achievement of the programme aims, which are to prepare highly qualified specialists in agriculture. These include: knowledge and understanding of the biology of farm animals and plants, animal productivity, heritability, ecology and environmental protection, animal nutrition and feeds, new technologies and production standards, practical and team work in solving professional issues. It is noted that welfare is not expressly among the learning outcomes and this should be recognized. The learning outcomes are set at the right level, EQF level six, as demonstrated by the terminology used in the descriptors, and include practical aspects to ensure professional competence. It is

suggested by the evaluation team that it would be worth consider the inclusion of explicit outcomes, and/or a module, to cover the animal welfare aspects involved in the husbandry of animals. An understanding of the welfare of animals is of import, and would be expected of graduating specialists in this discipline, of particular need for those seeking employment elsewhere in the EU. Also an outcome could be included into the programme to ensure awareness of organic agriculture. The subject content, regarding theory and practical components, have been revised since the last evaluation visit. It is noted and appreciated that students and social partners clearly have effective input into the content and sequence of delivery of the learning outcomes and such changes that result from these inputs are implemented in a timely fashion. The introduction of a diary log for students to record and document achievement of practical activities is a useful addition to the achievement of outcomes.

The objectives are clearly linked to state and labour market needs, particularly in this regard the outcomes related to professional practice “to work in a team solving professional issues, to consistently improve professional skills of a technologist of animal husbandry”, and the employability of graduates of this course is high. The programme aims are valued by the management of the Institution as part of their subject spectrum delivery, and are prepared to support the course even if it is not financially profitable.

While it is recognized that the title has been changed following recommendation from the previous evaluation visit, it is suggested to address this again as it is not ideally attuned to the programme aims, as this course (and its consistent learning outcomes) is not only about the technologies of animal husbandry, but has a wider animal husbandry scope, and a change in the title might improve student recruitment. This was also acknowledged and approved by the students and social partners. It was noted that the senior management team are considering merging this degree course with the degree in animal science. This might improve recruitment, but care should be taken not to restrict the range of opportunities for students and the needs of the sector. The numbers of students embarking on this course remain low and have declined over the last two years, 22 entered the programme in 2016 compared to 32 in the previous year. If numbers continue to decline this will risk the validity of the course and impair the needs of the society for graduates in the agricultural sector in Lithuania. It is suggested to address this.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum meets legal requirements, and those of the institution, with 240 ECTS in total, for both the full time and the continuous programme students. Contact hours have been reduced

to meet the requirements. There is no difference between these two study options regarding the number of study subjects. Study field subjects and electives and general university subjects as reported in the SER seem to be well balanced, with 3 ECTS allotted for elective subjects in each semester except for the final year. The sequencing of module delivery has been changed to meet student requests. This was not an important difference, and was made to suit student convenience, but demonstrates that student input is taken seriously and is acted upon. There is no repetition of subjects. There is no difference between the demands on student work load between modules, nor between the students' perception of difference in difficulty between modules. This is a good thing and shows that the course content is delivered at a similar level and with similar demands on student time throughout. The students are also content with the courses' content.

Subject contents are related to learning outcomes, as evidenced by the SER and by student comments of their experience. Explicit curriculum content in animal welfare and in organic livestock production are recommended, as they are currently missing; students were also aware of this need and mentioned this unprompted during their meeting with the evaluation team.

Evaluation team learned that programme committee meetings are a forum for the development of the curriculum. It is a little unclear as to whether these are held monthly (as reported by senior management) or annually (as reported in the SER). In one place of SER it says there were 20 meetings of Programme Committee within the period of the Report.

It is suggested that better use of learning opportunities available through the internet be made to better meet learning outcomes. Especially interactive learning tools (e.g. quizzes, wikis, self evaluations) should be developed and used. Further other institutions include students in development of such interactive learning tools, which could be considered as well. This is particularly relevant for the self-study hours. The use of email, the Institution intranet and setting of task assignments are in use and in development, but these could be more formalized and more interactive; this was also noted to be insufficient by the students.

The programme scope is sufficient to meet the stated learning outcomes, but there remains concern about the final thesis, with students not appearing to be sufficiently prepared for this research project work, particularly for research methodology, statistics and referencing. The students themselves were unclear about the instructions they had been given for the production of a high quality thesis. The module Basics of Research Methodology is an elective module for this course, it is suggested that this be made a compulsory module.

The practical part of the curriculum has been improved through the use of opportunities for practical experience offered by a number of the social partners. Concrete examples of these were confirmed by social partners, it is not thought appropriate to publically list these here.

The course content is supported by teaching staff's own scholarly work, which however could be improved. Particularly in terms of an increase in the internationally recognized publication of their work.

The internationality of the course content is recognized, by staff and by students.

All in all, the content corresponds to academic and technological achievements and this can be seen in the subjects' descriptors, final thesis and from discussion with students.

2.3. Teaching staff

The qualifications, breadth of expertise and number of staff are a good basis for the successful achievements of the aims and outcomes of this programme. There are 42 members of teaching staff contributing to the programme, around a third are Professors and a further third are Associate Professors. Almost 80% of the staff hold a PhD. Staff undergo an evaluation every five years and must meet benchmark standards to remain on the programme team. The age profile of the staff is good, there are not a large number of older staff, and none over the age of 65. Some of the staff are employed part-time by social partners. This clearly helps with contacts and subject knowledge currency. Staff are aware of the institution's policy on special needs students. In addition, there have been some outside lectures from overseas institutions, from Austria and Germany.

Students are generally happy with the quality of the teaching, but it was noted from student comments that there is some variability in the quality of the teaching. The staff are seen by the students to be supportive and approachable but there seemed to be different understanding of institutional examination policy among staff. This should be corrected.

Staff international mobility has improved since the most recent evaluation in 2014. Staff can apply for mobility once every three years, and two members of staff have taken advantage of this opportunity in the last year. However, the opportunity to apply for such mobility support once in three years is a little meagre. The advantages of staff mobility are invaluable to improve their

own practice and perspectives. It is recommended that this international experience be further encouraged and enhanced.

English language competence among staff is encouraged and language development is offered by the institution, although the competence remains variable.

Staff support the Student Science Society by attendance at society meetings, encouragement and administrative assistance.

Staff have attended a good number of scientific conferences. Staff scholarly output should be encouraged. Current research publications by staff are currently of poor international visibility. It is recognized by the team that applied research in the local context is valuable, while it may not be of interest internationally. However, international publication in respected journals should be encouraged.

Staff receive courses provided internally by the institution on pedagogy, for a minimum of 30 hours over five years. This is considered by the team to be adequate to support currency and reflection in the teaching offered. The staff also undergo attestation every five years.

Staff turnover is reported to be low, with retirement and maternity leave being the main causes for leaving post; according to the SER “Changing a job place is a rare case”. This is a good sign, although if this is very low this might need to stagnation in course delivery and innovation.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

All teaching rooms we visited (among others computer class room, reading rooms, teaching rooms at the university farm) are very well designed and equipped and allow high quality teaching. The laboratories (among others laboratory for meat characteristics and meat quality evaluation, laboratory of the institute for investigation of biologic systems and genetics, Josifas Tacas centre for milking technology, Vivarium) are likewise well equipped, with a good amount of space, they are new or recently refurbished, built for purpose, hygienic and safe to use. Comparing with other institutions it has been noticed that the current status is excellent. It was noted that students are not charged a fee for the analysis of their samples, which is a good thing. There are laboratory animals on-site. Students also have access to farm animals, other than cattle on the university farm, through the openness of social partners to permit student visits to their facilities.

The library facilities and learning resources available for students and researchers were generally very positive and gave no cause for concern. The opening hours are generous and convenient. The number of work places (544) and reading rooms are more than sufficient to allow studying. Likewise the availability of computers in the library is excellent. In comparison to last visit smaller rooms were made available to facilitate group work. The number of available titles and electronic subscriptions given in the SER allows comprehensive literature work; it has also positively noted by the examination committee that the number of available books, journals and databases has substantially increased recently.

The university farm is a dairy farm for around 150 cows with a 2 by 4 milking parlour, and includes examples of the Lithuanian Grey, a local rare breed. It is well organised and equipped for student instruction in this subject. It is clearly a functioning teaching farm. There are teaching rooms, for up to around 80 students, and an observation room. There are changing rooms, rest rooms, a room for sample preparation and storage and a crush for the demonstration of handling and procedures. The farm manager was aware of the conflicting priorities and balance between the economic needs of the farm and student needs for learning. This is to be commended. The farm manager also confirmed the frequent visits of students to the university farm for learning. Students take part in milking tasks in the first year and later carry out more complicated tasks. They also take part in commercial trials that are carried out on the farm, and are taught to use the herd management programme in use on the farm. The students also reported that they are appreciative of the farm and laboratory facilities. This is a valuable resource for student learning and is clearly appropriate and well used.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

Admissions information to this programme are available publically and are regulated by state legislation regarding the general requirements for admission to first cycle higher education programmes. There was no evidence of wrongful or inappropriate admission of students onto this programme.

There is a Student Scientific Society that receives administrative and funding support from the institution, and this is to be commended. The engagement of students with self-study learning opportunities could be more formalized and more effective. The practical training of students is considered to be sufficient by the senior management team, and while this may well be true

students would like more of it. There is language development available to students, which is important for their future prospects.

Academic and pastoral support for students could be better formalized. The students appreciate the support that they receive from staff and their approachability, which is commendable, but there is no formal mentoring process, especially for students who may be struggling but unwilling or unconfident enough to actively seek help from staff.

Final year theses remain improvable. Although they were generally well written and clearly described, with some interesting results and investigation themes, the sampled theses seen by the evaluation team often showed a weakness in research methodology and referencing (which included a lot of unreviewed material such as that from Wikipedia and google sources). There was also a limited range in the research topics which, given the range of expertise among the teaching staff, could be significantly wider. Students should have more support in the preparation and execution of their final year research projects.

There were no complaints by the students regarding the fairness or level of difficulty in their assessments. They considered the marks they were given to have been appropriate. The choice of assessment method is made by the staff teaching each module, and in most cases this is a *viva voce* examination, which is not the fairest method of assessment. There is a system of cumulative marks awarded throughout the course. There is some institution-level regulation regarding the assessment, in which the final examination should not exceed 50% of the overall module assessment. The marking of student final year theses is neither sufficiently transparent nor perhaps consistent. It is not fully clear where the marking decisions come from, and what criteria are used to reach the grading decisions, only a final mark was provided in the sample theses. It is recommended to at least show the marks for the thesis and for the oral presentation separately.

There is evident student international mobility, with 2-3 Erasmus-funded study visits abroad in the last year by students on this course. This is good progress, and an improvement on the figures for mobility at the last evaluation, but there could still be more involvement. The students reported that they are not necessarily interested in the chance to study abroad, but they could be more motivated to engage in such opportunities.

Students' work is subject to an electronic plagiarism checking system. Students and staff were aware of the institution's regulations regarding plagiarism.

Programme graduates are employed in the sector, and the opportunities for such employment nationally are good. It is therefore well attuned to the needs of the sector at the state level. The careers centre is considered good by the senior management team, but the students seemed unaware of this facility, or thought it was not necessary. Students should be made better aware of this resource.

The management of self-study by students could be tightened up, particularly in regard to opportunities for using interactive facilities. As described above self-studying should be made more effective using interactive approaches like quizzes, wikis, self-evaluation test and similar learning tools.

The learning environment is fair, given that the assessment methods as reported above might be not the fairest. Staff are aware of special needs requirements and institutional regulations to ensure a fair learning environment for students with such additional needs. There were no complaints of unfairness or partiality towards the students in regard to the assessment. The student work-load was thought by the students to be well balanced between modules.

There is evident opportunity for students to make complaints and appeals, as the students themselves reported. But this appears to be somewhat informal. There is a process of anonymous feedback from students through student questionnaires. It is clear that student comments and feedback are sought and are acted upon, this is good practice.

The students would appreciate a social space where they could sit, study and engage with each other informally.

2.6. Programme management

Programme implementation is discussed at the Study Programme Committee meetings, that meet either monthly (Senior management source) or annually (according to the SER). Also, SER states there were 20 meetings of Committee at all during the period of the Report. It would be just helpful if the exact responsibilities for named persons and named office holders be described in the SER, rather than simply referring to this committee.

It is clear that data regarding the implementation of the course are collected and analysed periodically, as evidenced from the SER and confirmed by comments by staff and management during the visit.

The withdrawal rate of students is a concern. It is the team's view that there is insufficient attention by management to this as a quality measure. According to the SER the withdrawal rate is around half, of those entering the course and those graduating. Reasons were given for this high rate, such as: maternity leave, students leaving to join the veterinary medicine course, the course not meeting student expectations and unmotivated and failing students. But these are not, in the main, reasons specific to this course, and it is suggested that there should be some formalised process in place at programme management level to minimize these student withdrawals.

Students and alumni are involved at various programme management levels, including the senate, faculty boards and the quality assurance board. This is clear and good practice to ensure that course content is current and relevant.

Information about this study programme is publically available, relevant and accessible, but it is not succeeding in attracting larger numbers of students to the course. There is a disconnect between the state, sectoral and societal needs for these graduates and career opportunities, which are all high, and the small numbers of students taking this course. Several reasons were given for this during the visit, from management, students, staff, alumni and social partners, but there is clearly an opportunity to increase the numbers of students and the validity of this course. It is recommended that marketing for this course be evaluated with the aim to increase numbers beyond their current levels.

The programme is clearly being changed and improved, and such improvements arise from outcomes with engagement with students and outside sources; this was confirmed by responses from staff, students and alumni. The process for such recommendations and changes to the programme can be unclear, and include informal representations by students to the Dean. While this is an admirable demonstration of approachability and listening to and acting on students comments, it is suggested that this be formalized. Maybe an annual review meeting at which all inputs from engaged parties, including staff, management, students, alumni and social partners be considered. Comments and suggestions could then be formally responded to, and then formally acted upon.

The evaluation team were provided with an action plan detailing recommendations from the previous evaluation report and responses to recommendations with actions taken in regard to them. The recommendations from the previous report have clearly been taken on board and have either been addressed or are being addressed. These were checked by the team from comments at the meetings with staff and students and social partners where appropriate.

2.7. Examples of excellence *

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Include specific outcomes to cover the welfare of animals and organic animal husbandry practice.
2. Consider revisiting the title of the programme.
3. Strategize to improve student recruitment.
4. Provide formalized student support, particularly in relation to final year research work.
5. Ensure clarity and staff awareness of examination policy.
6. Encourage and enhance staff and student engagement with international mobility.
7. Formalize and put in practice a process to address student withdrawals.
8. List names and responsibilities of members and meeting dates of the Study Programme Committee.
9. Consider introducing an annual review meeting at which all inputs from engaged parties, including staff, management, students, alumni and social partners be considered.

IV. SUMMARY

This course is clearly meeting a need, and producing graduates with the knowledge to meet that need. The students are happy with the course and report that it is meeting their expectations. The course content is related to the stated learning outcomes. The learning outcomes are appropriate, are at the right level and meet the requirements for graduates in this sector. It is noted that social partners and students have effective inputs into the design of the extant learning outcomes. It is recommended by the evaluation team that the learning outcomes could include explicit learning in the welfare of animals and organic livestock systems. Curricular content is clearly related to the stated learning outcomes and allows for their achievement. There is room for improvement in the course content regarding the preparation of students for their research theses. The programme design and delivery are clearly responsive to amendment and improvement following staff, student, alumni and stakeholder inputs. Teaching staff and management are clearly approachable by students and respond to student concerns and inputs for change. Teaching staff are also numerous, suitably qualified and have a good range of expertise. Regular attestation of staff, pedagogical training and the low turnover rates of staff are all positive. The facilities provided for this course are of very good quality, particularly the on-farm facilities for student practice, and are clearly used to support learning. Student admissions are fair and student assessment is also impartial, although there is a high dependence on viva voce examinations, which might not suit all students and is not considered the fairest of assessment methods. There is some lack of formal processes in some aspects of the course (annual review, marketing of the course, assessment processes) and the student withdrawal rate is high. While international mobility has improved, by both staff and students, this engagement could be further encouraged. The membership, meeting frequency and roles of the Study Programme Committee remain not fully clear, and the same applies for the process by which such amendments are addressed - this process could be better formalized.

The evaluation team are impressed with many aspects of this course, and it is hoped that these suggestions will help to improve the quality and validity of this programme.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Animal Husbandry Technology* (state code – 6121IX001) at Lithuanian University of Health Sciences is given a **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	4
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	19

*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. Thomas Wittek
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Dr. David Arney
	Prof. Dr. Piotr Nowakowski
	Rita Naudužienė
	Simonas Pusvaškis

**LIETUVOS SVEIKATOS MOKSLŲ UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *GYVULININKYSTĖS TECHNOLOGIJA* (VALSTYBINIS
KODAS – 6121IX001) 2017-08-22 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-180
IŠRAŠAS**

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Lietuvos sveikatos mokslų universiteto studijų programa *Gyvulininkystės technologija* (valstybinis kodas – 6121IX001) 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	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	19

* 1 - Nepatenkinamai (yra esminių trūkumų, kuriuos būtina pašalinti)

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

3 - Gerai (sistemiškai plėtojama sritis, turi savitų bruožų)

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Ši studijų programa akivaizdžiai atitinka specialistų poreikį, ją baigę absolventai turi reikiamų žinių. Studentai šia programa patenkinti ir teigia, jog ji tenkina jų lūkesčius. Studijų programos turinys yra susijęs su įvardytais studijų rezultatais. Studijų rezultatai yra tinkami, tinkamo lygio bei atitinka šio sektoriaus absolventams keliamus reikalavimus. Pastebima, kad socialiniai partneriai ir studentai efektyviai prisideda formuojant esamus studijų rezultatus. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja į studijų rezultatus įtraukti išsamų mokymąsi apie gyvulių gerovę bei natūralias galvijų sistemas. Studijų turinys aiškiai susijęs su numatytais studijų rezultatais, sudaryta galimybė juos pasiekti. Reikėtų gerinti programos turinį, kad studentai būtų labiau rengiami mokslinių tyrimų darbams. Sudarant programos turinį ir ją vykdant reaguojama į personalo, studentų, absolventų ir socialinių dalininkų pastabas bei siūlomus tobulinimus. Studentai gali lengvai susisiekti su dėstančiuoju personalu ir vadovybe, kurie reaguoja į studentų klausimus ir pastabas dėl tobulinimo. Dėstančiojo personalo skaičius pakankamas, jis tinkamai kvalifikuotas

ir turi plačią kvalifikaciją. Personalas reguliariai dalyvauja atestacijose, rengiami pedagoginiai mokymai, personalo kaita yra nedidelė. Šiai studijų programai užtikrinamos labai aukštos kokybės patalpos, ypač fermos patalpos, kuriose studentai atlieka praktiką, jos akivaizdžiai naudojamos mokymosi tikslais. Studentų priėmimas vykdomas sąžiningai, o studentų vertinimas – objektyvus, nors priėmimas labai priklauso nuo egzamino žodžiu, kuris gali netikti visiems studentams ir nėra laikomas pačiu teisingiausiu vertinimo metodu. Kai kuriuose studijų programos aspektuose trūksta formalių procesų (metinio vertinimo, studijų programos rinkodaros, vertinimo procesų), be to, didelis studentų pasitraukimo skaičius. Nors tiek personalo, tiek studentų tarptautinio judumo lygis pagerėjo, šį aspektą galima būtų dar labiau tobulinti. Studijų programos komiteto nariai, susirinkimų dažnumas ir jo vaidmuo nėra visiškai aiškūs, taip pat neaišku, kaip taikomi pakeitimai; šis procesas turėtų būti aiškiau įformintas. Vertinimo grupei padarė įspūdį daugelis šios studijų programos aspektų, taip pat tikimasi, kad pateikti siūlymai padės gerinti šios studijų programos kokybę ir pailgins jos galiojimą.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Reikėtų įtraukti konkrečius studijų rezultatus, susijusius su gyvulių gerove ir natūralios gyvulininkystės praktika.
2. Vertėtų iš naujo peržiūrėti programos pavadinimą.
3. Reikėtų parengti strategiją, kaip pagerinti studentų įsidarbinamumą.
4. Reikėtų teikti formalią pagalbą studentams, ypač susijusių su baigiamųjų metų moksliniais tiriamaisiais darbais.
5. Reikėtų užtikrinti, kad egzaminavimo politika būtų aiški ir personalas ją žinotų.
6. Vertėtų skatinti ir stiprinti personalo ir studentų susidomėjimą tarptautiniu judumu.
7. Reikėtų įforminti ir praktiškai įgyvendinti procesą, kuris sumažintų studentų pasitraukimą iš studijų.
8. Reikėtų sudaryti Studijų programos komiteto narių vardų, pavardžių bei atsakomybių ir susirinkimo datų sąrašą.

9. Reikėtų apsvarstyti galimybę organizuoti kasmetį peržiūros susirinkimą, kuriame būtų aptariamas visų susijusių šalių, įskaitant personalą, vadovybę, studentus, absolventus ir socialinius partnerius, indėlis.

<...>

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)