STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

ALEKSANDRO STULGINSKIO UNIVERSITETO
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *"SUMANIOJI GYVULININKYSTĖ"*
(valstybinis kodas - 6121IX010)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS
–––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *"SMART ANIMAL HUSBANDRY"* (*state code - 6121IX010*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at ALEKSANDRAS STULGINSKIS UNIVERSITY

Review' team:

1. **Marion Coy (team leader),** *academic,*

2. **Dr. David Wright,** *academic,*

3. **Dr. Rein Lillak,** *academic,*

4. **Mr Kęstutis Skrupskelis,** *representative of social partners'*

5. **Ms Iveta Mykolaitytė,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator - *Ms Gabrielė Bajorinaitė*

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2017

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	*Sumanioji gyvulininkystė*
Valstybinis kodas	6121IX010
Studijų sritis	Biomedicinos mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Žemės ūkio mokslai
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (3,5 m)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	210
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Žemės ūkio mokslų bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2014-04-02

————————————————————————

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	*Smart animal husbandry*
State code	6121IX010
Study area	Biomedical Sciences
Study field	Agricultural Sciences
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (3,5 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	210
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Agricultural Sciences
Date of registration of the study programme	2nd April, 2014

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
-	

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

Aleksandras Stulginskis University, located in Akademija, Kaunas, has a long history of teaching and research in agriculture. It developed from the Lithuanian Agricultural Academy (which was relocated to Kaunas in 1946) and was renamed as the Lithuanian University of Agriculture in 1996. It was granted the name Aleksandras Stulginskis University in 2011. It has

five faculties: Agronomy, Economics and Management, Forest Sciences and Ecology, Agricultural Engineering, Water and Land Management. The University delivers a wide range of bachelor, master and doctoral degrees in agriculture and related subjects. The bachelor degree in Smart Animal Husbandry is delivered by the Faculty of Agricultural Engineering and the Faculty of Agronomy and is in the study field of Biomedical Sciences. The programme is a relatively new development for the University. It started in 2014 and so at the time of this review the first cohort of students were in their third year. The programme is of 3.5 years duration and hence the review team were not able to meet any graduates or view any final theses.

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 *22/May/2017*.

Review team:

1. **Marion Coy (team leader),** *President emeritus of Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology, Higher Education Consultant (Ireland);*

2. **Dr. David Wright,** *Senior Lecturer in Agriculture at Bangor University (United Kingdom);*

3. **Dr. Rein Lillak,** *Lecturer at Estonian University of Life Sciences, President of NGO Environment and Culture (Estonia);*

4. **Mr Kęstutis Skrupskelis,** *Biologist at Institute of Ecology of Nature Research Centre (Lithuania);*

5. **Ms Iveta Mykolaitytė,** *Student of Medicine Master programme at Lithuanian University of Health Sciences (Lithuania);*

Evaluation Coordinator - Ms Gabriele Bajorinaite

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

Agriculture and its related industries make an important contribution to the economy of Lithuania. Studies have shown that there is a national shortage of trained specialists in animal husbandry and this programme aims to meet this demand. The University currently offers degrees in agricultural technologies and management, agronomy, agricultural business management, agricultural economics and agricultural engineering and management. Therefore the programme in Smart Animal Husbandry complements its existing portfolio. It also provides an example of how strategic planning within the University has enabled it to address a national requirement for development.

The self-evaluation report clearly outlines the rationale for the development of the programme and the national economic argument for its existence. In the self-evaluation report and in conversation with social partners, management and teaching staff, the review team found a high level of awareness of how this programme met specific national economic, social and cultural requirements. The self-evaluation report notes the absence of a "standard for agricultural science in Lithuania". In the self-evaluation report the programme was described as "unique" because it is based on the use of smart technologies. It would be helpful to have a fuller exploration of this assertion in the self-evaluation report. Benchmarking of the programme against national or international comparators would also strengthen the document.

The self-evaluation report states that the main aim of the programme is to '*train highly qualified specialists of animal husbandry, providing them with basic and specialised knowledge and abilities that are essential for self-contained work and professional activity related to the organisation of the manufacture of livestock products, selection of advanced methods of farm animal breeding, implementation and management of smart technologies of animal housing and feeding, as well as ensuring proper conditions for animal welfare and productivity, quality and safety of livestock products, environmental requirements, high competitiveness, profitability and socially responsible integration into the processes of rural development*'.

The title of the programme reflects its intended learning outcomes, academic content and level. However, the students suggested that there might be merit in reviewing the title of the Programme. In particular, they noted that the use of the word "Smart" may not be widely understood and that it may deter prospective entrants and impact on their employability. When asked for their preferred title, they indicated that they would prefer the term, "technological". The review team was impressed by their argument and feels that this student proposal merits serious consideration. A feature of the programme is its emphasis on technology, which the senior management team believe distinguishes it from other programmes that have a stronger biological content.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme are generally well-written and conform to level 6 of the Lithuanian Qualification Framework and the European Qualification Framework. For example, graduates acquire fundamental theoretical knowledge of agricultural sciences, integrated knowledge of livestock nutrition and specialised knowledge of sustainable animal husbandry. Emphasis is placed on knowledge based on the latest research and the use of new technologies. Graduates also develop research, special, personal and social skills, including an ability to collect, analyse and evaluate data, to make decisions and solve problems, to apply the knowledge they have gained in professional activities and to communicate effectively to

those involved. Graduates also acquire knowledge of economics and management, so that they are able to make sound and socially responsible business decisions.

Full information about the programme, including its learning outcomes, the details of each subject studied and the qualifications of the teachers involved are publicly available on the University website.

2.2. Curriculum design

The structure of the programme conforms to the legislative requirements of the Republic of Lithuania: the scope of the programme is 210 ECTS, with 171 ECTS in the subjects in the main field and 18 credits allocated for practice. The review team were informed that teaching staff did not have an input into the initial development of the programme, but were asked to comment on the proposals.

General university subjects in the first year develop students' proficiency in English and hence their opportunities to participate in international exchange programmes. The courses in 'Professional Language' and 'Introduction into Studies' ensure that students are prepared for study at university level. For example, they explain common terms used in agriculture, how to select and use information sources and how to produce scientific text according to standard conventions.

The knowledge and skills of students are developed in a systematic way. First year modules cover the scientific principles relevant to animal husbandry. These are developed in second year applied science modules, for example those relating to animal health, welfare and breeding. In their third year students study the production of the main classes of livestock in detail. This is reflected in the learning outcomes, with students developing more detailed knowledge and higher level skills as they progress through the programme. For example, in their first year students are expected to 'Know the physiological processes occurring in animal organisms. In their second year students are expected to be able to 'Identify farm animals' nutritional needs using new methods, according to their physiological needs and productivity parameters. In their third year students 'Develop an ability to apply and critically evaluate advanced smart technologies for livestock breeding, feeding and keeping'.

However, most of the staff and students the review team met were not able to explain how teaching, learning and assessment and the knowledge and skills students are expected to be able to demonstrate should develop from the first through to the final year of the programme. This is referred to again in the section on programme management.

Students also acquire knowledge of the wider context for their studies, including the relevant European Union policies and regulations, for example relating to pollution and

environmental protection, livestock management and economics, so that recent developments are integrated into the content of the programme.

The curriculum provides opportunities for students to specialise by their choice of elective study subject in the third year, their practice placement and their choice of final thesis topic. These are negotiated with their thesis supervisor and can include participation in University research projects. At the time of the review students had not completed these activities and hence the review team was not able to assess these elements.

Careful planning of the curriculum and regular discussions between teaching staff ensure that there is no duplication within the programme. This was confirmed by the students that the review team met.

The programme includes appropriate teaching methods, including lectures, laboratory and practical work. The students the review team met commented that they had received many lectures relating to theory and that they wanted more practice. This was considered to be particularly important for those students that did not come from family farms. However, the review team noted that the training practice was held in semester 7, so that no students had completed it as yet.

The programme has yet to complete one full cycle. However teaching staff are already considering improvements to the curriculum, for example the inclusion of robotics and the use of farm management software.

2.3. Teaching staff

The number (34 teachers) and academic qualifications (86 % with scientific degree) of the staff teaching on the programme meet the legal requirements of the Republic of Lithuania. Almost all of them are members of the full-time staff of the University. There has been very little turnover of teaching staff since the programme started in 2014.

The teaching staff has a wide range of relevant professional experience, at national and international level. This includes participation in conferences, membership of scientific and professional associations and leading or participating in research projects. Staff members have also published research papers in journals covered by the ISI Web of Science. However the review team noted that levels of activity and the number of publications and the citation score of journals varied between staff.

The students the review team met reported that most academic staff are enthusiastic teachers. The University monitors their effectiveness by annual surveys of students and surveys of teaching staff every two years. The teaching staff reported that they receive the results of these surveys and are able to make changes in response to them and this is considered commendable.

As this is a new programme some staff have been required to teach new subjects. This appears to be working well. The teaching staff reported that they used Moodle, that they had received training in its use and that they used it extensively to provide course information for students. However this was not fully supported by students, who commented that many staff did not use it.

Academic staff members were positive about their experience in the University. The University provides opportunities for staff training and development. Staff reported that they have a variety of opportunities to travel, including participation in the ERASMUS programme and receive financial and other support from the University for this. However the extent of participation in international exchanges is low and in its self-evaluation report the University has recognised that there is a need to increase this.

In a degree programme of this type it is very important for staff to keep up to date with the latest scientific and technological innovations. Although some teaching staff have links outside the University the review team concluded that the programme and its students would benefit from stronger links between teaching staff and other scientific and technological institutions. The self-evaluation report recognised that there are some weaknesses in the links between teaching and research. It did not however, outline any systematic approach to dealing with this weakness.

Academic staff expressed a desire to develop a post-graduate programme in this discipline. Planning for this development needs to consider the availability of students, the development of the research profile of the department and the range of national and international linkages. The self-evaluation report also makes reference to 'the unfavourable national approach" to the applied nature of scientific research in agriculture. The University needs to engage with other institutions in resolving this problem.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The University has good facilities and learning resources to support this programme. Students have free, well organised access to laboratories which are well equipped. Any consumables required for final thesis research are provided free of charge. In addition, students can use the University's laboratories for small scale applied research relating to their own farm. The review team is strongly supportive of this, as it is both attractive and motivating. Students are also able to become involved in staff research projects. However, both students and teachers commented that interest in scientific research is low in comparison with applied research. These opportunities would be enhanced by collaboration with scientific laboratories in other universities, research stations or commercial companies.

Collaboration with social partners is effective and provides students with a wide spectrum of opportunities for practice. It has also helped the University to equip technical teaching facilities with up-to-date software and modern equipment. For example, the review team saw a modern milking unit used for training students that had been established with financial support from a commercial company. The university experimental station and farm also provide facilities for practical training. Students are also able to work with new technologies on the farms of social partners during their professional practice. In some cases students are paid. Social partners are also invited to make theoretical and practical presentations of innovations in the industry.

Students reported that library resources including workstations, books and loan periods are adequate. First year students receive training on how to find useful and relevant information in the library and from the 17 databases that the University subscribes to. Students also value the fact that they are able to access the University's library resources remotely.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

Entrance requirements are transparent and published on the University website. However, a major difficulty facing the programme is that student numbers have fallen. The programme admitted 33 students in 2104, its first year of operation, 23 in 2015 and only 10 in 2016. The University attributes the fall in numbers to the decrease in the overall population of Lithuania, uncertainty created by falling prices for agricultural commodities, a decrease in the number of young people interested in agriculture and their preference to seek employment in urban areas. The review team were also informed that students from rural areas find it more difficult to meet University entry requirements. Management, teaching staff and social partners reported that there are many job opportunities for specialists in animal husbandry. Therefore the review team urges the University to intensify its effort to recruit additional students.

Study processes are well-planned and made clear in information provided to students. There are very good opportunities associated with the programme for international mobility and for scientific research and these strengths should be highlighted to potential students. Students indicated that they had good opportunities to do scientific work and good access to facilities. The review team was very impressed by the Research Centre associated with this programme and feels that it will be a major asset to the development of the knowledge, skills and competencies of the students and appreciates such academic support. The review team anticipates that many additional opportunities for students will emerge as the programmes links to local industry, national and international research institutions expand.

The students the review team met expressed their high level of satisfaction with the course. When asked for suggestions on improvements, they mentioned that it would be useful to have more books available in electronic format. The students also noted an uneven pattern of use of Moodle by teaching staff. Pedagogical development for some staff may be required to address this issue.

As anticipated, the review team found that the existing cohort of students almost all came from a farming background. Among the small number who didn't, there was a desire for additional practical work on the Programme. If the Programme is to enlarge its appeal to students from non-farming backgrounds, this suggestion may need attention. The social partners also highlighted the desire for additional practical work.

The review team was concerned when told by students that 7 students in year 3 did not attend lectures but did attend practical work. This is not a pattern of engagement with study that the Review team finds acceptable, notwithstanding the availability of lecture notes.

In describing the weekly academic timetable, students mentioned the block delivery of theory in "2-3 academic hours". Some analysis of the impact of this approach to learning would be welcome.

Students were also asked to describe the formal review and complaints procedures operated by the University. They were unable to do so and instead referred to informal procedures. The quality assurance procedures must be strengthened in respect of this matter.

Regarding mobility programmes, student's participation is quite good (in 2015/2016 - 5 students; in 2016/2017- 3 students, SER p. 24) having in mind the students number in the programme.

The students the review team met expressed the view that assessment tasks were clear and appropriate and that marking was fair. They commented that tasks became more challenging and that they were expected to provide more detail and make greater use of scientific journals as they progressed through the programme. The feedback they receive from academic staff helps them to improve future assessment submissions. They raised no complaints in relation to assessment processes.

2.6. Programme management

The programme is managed according to the normal procedures of the University. These ensure that students and social partners are involved in programme management and that any changes proposed are checked and approved by higher level authorities within the University. The Study Programme Committee is responsible for the primary monitoring of the programme. It consists of teachers from the programme and has a representative from students

and one from the social partners. Any recommendations are submitted for consideration to the Faculty Council and require the approval of the University Senate.

The students the review team met commented that they are frequently asked for their views on the programme, either formally through surveys or in meetings organised by the Vice Dean. For example, when one of their teachers was difficult to understand, they had raised the matter and the University had responded by replacing him/her with another member of staff.

The University conducts a large number of surveys of students to gather information about their experience of the study subjects and teachers. The review team were informed that the response rate to these surveys varied between 33% and 50%. However, students expressed the view that there were too many surveys and that this lowered their participation. The University should consider whether fewer, more targeted surveys would result in higher participation rates and therefore more representative results. Teaching staff reported that they receive the results of the student evaluations and can make changes in response to them. The University also needs to ensure that when students suggest changes they receive feedback on their proposals, explaining why the University has or has not been able to adopt their proposals.

The review team was informed that the teaching staff did not have an input into the initial development of the programme or the preparation of the self-evaluation report. However they were invited to comment on the draft.

In addition to the annual surveys of students the University conducts surveys of teaching staff every two years. The self-evaluation report also notes that the University conducts social surveys of graduates and employers. Topical information collected by the Career Centre, the Faculty and various departments of the University is discussed by the Study Programme Committee. However the review team were informed that the information obtained is not compiled into a single annual review document. Hence the annual review process needs to be more coordinated and its outcomes incorporated into any future self-evaluation reports. In addition, any future self-evaluation report needs to be more widely circulated within the institution, especially to teaching staff, students and social partners.

The review team were informed that the University intends to review the programme once the outcomes of this review are known.

The decrease in student numbers threatens the viability of the programme. In order to address this it is important that the University undertakes a review of the whole marketing and recruitment process, considering internal as well as external factors. The review team recommends that the University reviews the title of the programme and in particular the use of the word 'smart'. The review should consider how this influences students' perception of the scope and nature of the programme and its attractiveness, particularly to those who are not from

or who do not wish to work on farms, but none the less wish to work in an applied scientific field. The self-evaluation report notes that there are good employment opportunities in businesses and agencies operated by social partners.

Many of the teaching staff and students the review team met were not able to explain clearly how teaching, assessment and the knowledge and skills students are expected to be able to demonstrate should advance from year to year within the programme. Therefore the University should take planned steps to increase the understanding of them by staff and students. Once a full cycle of the programme has been completed it would be useful to review the curriculum. There are opportunities in some study subjects to strengthen the knowledge, skills and competencies students acquire. For example, in their third year students might be expected to 'demonstrate detailed knowledge', rather than 'know', and to 'critically evaluate recent research and technological advances', particularly in those subject areas that have been developed progressively from the first through to the third year.

The review team found evidence of strong links between teaching and research in certain areas of the curriculum, supported by good laboratory facilities. These create opportunities for the future development of the programme. The University should take steps to increase the involvement of students, especially those in years three and four, in its research activity.

As noted above a more systematic approach by the senior management team to the benchmarking of the programme against appropriate national and international comparators would also help to strengthen it.

2.7. Examples of excellence *

The development and delivery of the programme has benefited from substantial involvement and support from social partners, who provided input into curriculum development and provided specialist equipment for training students. Their assistance in developing the research laboratories is particularly impressive.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The University is recommended to:

1. Review the title of the programme. It needs to reflect the technological and scientific basis of the programme, so that it is fully understood by a wider audience and so that it attracts students who do not come from a farming background, but who would like a career in an applied scientific field.

2. Identify and address any internal factors that may contribute to lower recruitment. This should include the balance between the practical and theoretical aspects of the programme.

3. Use the opportunities for students to participate in research and its well-equipped laboratories and training facilities to promote the programme.

4. Establish more links with high quality, high-level scientific and technological institutions.

5. Take steps to ensure that all teaching staff are up-to-date with both scientific and technological developments in their subjects.

6. Develop a systematic approach to benchmarking the programme against national and international comparators.

7. Ensure that all students are familiar with the formal review, complaints and appeals procedures of the University.

IV. SUMMARY

The University currently offers degrees in agricultural technologies and management, agronomy, agricultural business management, agricultural economics and agricultural engineering and management. Therefore the programme in Smart Animal Husbandry complements its existing portfolio. It also provides an example of how strategic planning within the University has enabled it to address a national requirement for development. The review team found a high level of awareness of how this programme met specific national economic, social and cultural requirements.

A feature of the programme is its emphasis on technology, which the senior management team believe distinguishes it from other programmes that have a stronger biological content The programme has yet to complete one full cycle. However teaching staff and the Study programme Committee are already considering improvements to the curriculum, for example the inclusion of robotics and the use of farm management software.

The teaching staff has a wide range of relevant professional experience, at national and international level. The University must ensure that all staff meets the requirement for continuous updating of their professional expertise.

Staff reported that they have a variety of opportunities to travel, including participation in the ERASMUS programme and receive financial and other support from the University for this. However the extent of participation in international exchanges is low and in its self-evaluation report the University has recognised that there is a need to increase this. In a degree programme of this type it is very important for staff to keep up to date with the latest scientific and technological innovations. Although some teaching staff have links outside the University the review team concluded that the programme and its students would benefit from stronger links between teaching staff and other scientific and technological institutions

Academic staff expressed a desire to develop a post-graduate programme in this discipline. Planning for this development needs to consider the availability of students, the development of the research profile of the department and the range of national and international linkages. The self-evaluation report also makes reference to 'the unfavourable national approach" to the applied nature of scientific research in agriculture. The University needs to engage with other institutions in resolving this problem.

Collaboration with social partners is effective and provides students with a wide spectrum of opportunities for practice. It has also helped the University to equip technical teaching facilities with up-to-date software and modern equipment. The University has good

facilities and learning resources to support this programme. Students have free, well organised access to laboratories.

However, a major difficulty facing the programme is that student numbers have fallen. The programme admitted 33 students in 2104, its first year of operation, 23 in 2015 and only 10 in 2016 Therefore the review team review team urges the University to intensify its effort to recruit additional students.

Study processes are well-planned and clear information is provided to students. There are very good opportunities associated with the programme for international mobility and for scientific research and these strengths should be highlighted to potential students. Students indicated that they had good opportunities to do scientific work and good access to facilities The annual review process needs to be more coordinated and its outcomes incorporated into any future self-evaluation reports. In addition, any future self-evaluation report needs to be more widely circulated within the institution, especially to teaching staff, students and social partners.

The review team recommends that the University review the title of the programme and in particular the use of the word 'smart'. The review should consider how this influences students' perception of the scope and nature of the programme and its attractiveness, particularly to those who are not from or who do not wish to work on farms, but none the less wish to work in an applied scientific field.

Once a full cycle of the programme has been completed it would be useful to review the curriculum. There are opportunities in some study subjects to strengthen the knowledge, skills and competencies students acquire.

A more systematic approach by the senior management team to the benchmarking of the programme against appropriate national and international comparators would help to strengthen it.

The University should ensure that all students are familiar with the formal review, complaints and appeals procedures of the University.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Smart Animal Husbandry* (state code – 6121IX010) 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	3
	Total:	**18**

*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:	Marion Coy
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Dr. David Wright
	Dr. Rein Lillak
	Kęstutis Skrupskelis
	Iveta Mykolaitytė

ALEKSANDRO STULGINSKIO UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *SUMANIOJI GYVULININKYSTĖ* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 6121IX010) 2017-08-22 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-182 IŠRAŠAS

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Aleksandro Stulginskio universiteto studijų programa *Sumanioji gyvulininkystė* (valstybinis kodas – 6121IX010) 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	3
	Iš viso:	**18**

* 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)

<...>

2.7 Išskirtinės kokybės pavyzdžiai

Svarus įsitraukimas ir parama iš socialinių partnerių, prisidėjusių prie programos sandaros vystymo bei suteikusių specialią įrangą studentų praktikai padėjo programos įgyvendinimui ir vystymuisi.

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Universitetas šiuo metu siūlo žemės ūkio technologijų ir vadybos, agronomijos, žemės ūkio verslo vadybos, žemės ūkio ekonomikos ir žemės ūkio inžinerijos ir vadybos laipsnius. Studijų programa *Sumanioji gyvulininkystė* papildo esamas studijų programas. Tai pavyzdys, kaip universiteto strateginis planavimas leido atsižvelgti į šalies plėtros reikalavimus. Ekspertų grupė išsiaiškino, kaip ši studijų programa atitinka konkrečius šalies ekonominius, socialinius ir kultūrinius poreikius.

Ypatingas šios studijų programos bruožas tas, kad daug dėmesio skiriama technologijoms, ir, vadovybės nuomone, tuo ji išsiskiria iš kitų studijų programų, kuriose daugiau dėmesio skiriama biologijos dėstymui. Ši studijų programa dar turi užbaigti pirmąją studijų pakopą. Tačiau dėstytojai ir Studijų programos komitetas jau svarsto studijų turinio patobulinimus, pavyzdžiui, norima įtraukti robotiką ir naudoti ūkio valdymo programinę įrangą.

 Dėstytojai turi plačią tinkamą profesinę patirtį šalies ir tarptautiniu mastu. Universitetas privalo garantuoti, kad visi dėstytojai atitiktų reikalavimus, kuriais numatomas nuolatinis profesinės patirties gilinimas.

Dėstytojai nurodė turintys daugybę galimybių keliauti, įskaitant dalyvavimą „Erasmus" programoje, taip pat iš universiteto gauti finansinę ir kitokią paramą. Tačiau dalyvavimas tarptautiniuose mainuose nėra aktyvus, o universiteto savianalizės suvestinėje pripažįstama, kad šią sritį reikia tobulinti. Tokio pobūdžio ir pakopos studijų programoje labai svarbu, kad personalas nuolat sektų naujausias mokslo ir technologines naujoves. Nors kai kurie dėstytojai turi ryšių už universiteto ribų, tačiau ekspertų grupė padarė išvadą, kad studijų programai ir jos studentams būtų naudinga, jei būtų užmegzti tvirtesni ryšiai tarp dėstytojų ir kitų mokslo ir technologijų institucijų.

Akademinis personalas išreiškė pageidavimą kurti šios disciplinos antrosios pakopos studijų programą. Planuojant šią programą, reikia atsižvelgti į studentų skaičių, parengti katedros mokslinių tyrimų profilį ir šalies bei tarptautinių ryšių diapazoną. Savianalizės suvestinėje taip pat nurodomas „nepalankus nacionalinis požiūris" į mokslinių tyrimų taikomąjį pobūdį žemės ūkio srityje. Universitetas turi spręsti šią problemą bendradarbiaudamas su kitomis institucijomis.

Bendradarbiavimas su socialiniais partneriais yra veiksmingas ir suteikia studentams daug praktinių galimybių. Tai padėjo universitetui technines mokymo patalpas aprūpinti naujausia programine ir šiuolaikiška kita reikiama įranga. Universitetas turi gerus materialiuosius išteklius, kurie padeda vykdyti šią studijų programą. Studentai gali nemokamai naudotis laboratorijomis, prieiga prie jų organizuota gerai.

Pagrindinis sunkumas, su kuriuo susiduria studijų programa, – sumažėjęs studentų skaičius. Pirmaisiais studijų programos metais, t. y. 2014-aisiais, į ją įstojo 33 studentai, 2015 m. – 23, o 2016 m. – tik 10. Todėl ekspertų grupė skatina universitetą dėti daugiau pastangų stojančiųjų skaičiui padidinti.

Studijų eiga suplanuota gerai, studentams informacija pateikiama aiškiai. Šioje studijų programoje sudarytos geros galimybės tarptautiniam judumui, moksliniams tyrimams ir būtent šios stiprybės turi būti akcentuojamos galimiems studentams. Studentai nurodė turintys geras galimybes atlikti mokslinį darbą ir naudotis materialiąja baze.

Būtina geriau koordinuoti kasmet atliekamą vertinimo procesą ir jo rezultatus įtraukti į būsimas savianalizės suvestines. Be to, reikėtų plačiau viešinti rengiamą savianalizės suvestinę ir pačiame universitete, ypač dėstytojams, studentams ir socialiniams partneriams.

Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja universitetui peržiūrėti studijų programos pavadinimą, ypač žodžio „sumanioji" vartojimą. Svarstant reikėtų atsižvelgti, kokią įtaką tai daro studentų šios studijų programos apimties ir pobūdžio suvokimui, jos patrauklumui, ypač tų studentų, kurie nėra gyvenę kaime arba nenorėtų dirbti ūkiuose, tačiau vis dėlto nori dirbti taikomųjų mokslinių tyrimų srityje.

Kai bus baigta visa šios studijų programos studijų pakopa, būtų naudinga iš naujo apsvarstyti studijų turinį. Kai kuriuose studijų dalykuose būtų galima pagerinti studentų įgyjamas žinias, įgūdžius ir kompetencijas.

Vyresnysis personalas turėtų taikyti sistemingesnį metodą lyginant šią studijų programą su atitinkamomis šalies ir tarptautinėmis programomis, o tai padėtų ją tobulinti.

Universitetas privalo garantuoti, kad visi studentai būtų susipažinę su formalia vertinimo, skundų ir apeliacijų teikimo tvarka.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

Universitetui rekomenduojama:

1. Apsvarstyti studijų programos pavadinimą. Jis turi atspindėti studijų programos technologinį ir mokslinį pagrindą, kad jį tinkamai suprastų platesnė auditorija ir kad jis pritrauktų studentų, neturinčių ūkininkavimo patirties, bet norinčių daryti karjerą taikomoje mokslinėje srityje.

2. Nustatyti vidaus veiksnius, kurie gali lemti mažesnį stojančiųjų skaičių. Tai turėtų apimti studijų programos praktinės ir teorinės dalių pusiausvyrą.

3. Išnaudoti galimybes studentams dalyvauti moksliniuose tyrimuose, dirbti gerai įrengtose laboratorijose bei naudotis mokymo materialiąja baze, siekiant reklamuoti studijų programą.

4. Užmegzti daugiau ryšių su aukšto lygio mokslo ir technologijų institucijomis.

5. Imtis priemonių, kurios užtikrintų, kad visi dėstytojai atnaujintų savo dalykų mokslo ir technologijų žinias.

6. Sukurti sistemingą metodą, kuris leistų palyginti šią studijų programą su kitomis šalies ir tarptautinėmis programomis.

7. Garantuoti, kad visi studentai būtų susipažinę su universiteto formalia vertinimo, skundų ir apeliacijų teikimo tvarka.

<...>

_____

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)