



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus universiteto  
**ORGANIZACIJŲ VYSTYMO PROGRAMOS (621N20008)**  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT**  
**OF DEVELOPMENT OF ORGANISATIONS (621N20008)**  
**STUDY PROGRAMME**  
at Vilnius University

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Hilyer, Roger
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Bakacsi, Gyula Dahlgaard-Park, Su Mi Day, Guenther Ipsilandis, Pandelis G. Mazonaviciute, Ingrida

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language - English

Vilnius  
2013

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Organizacijų vystymas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621N20008
Studijų sritis	socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Vadyba
Studijų programos rūšis	nuolatinės
Studijų pakopa	antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	2
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	vadybos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	24.05.2001

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Development of Organisations</i>
State code	621N20008
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Management
Kind of the study programme	full-time
Cycle of studies	second cycle
Study mode (length in years)	2
Scope of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications	Master

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

## CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....	4
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	4
2. Curriculum design.....	7
3. Teaching staff .....	9
4. Facilities and learning resources .....	10
5. Study process and students' performance assessment .....	11
6. Programme management .....	11
III. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	12
IV. SUMMARY .....	14
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....	16

## I. INTRODUCTION

Development of Organizations, second cycle, master programme was started in 2001. Originally, it was called Business Management master programme (state code 62103S102). Therefore, now the 2<sup>nd</sup> year students, admitted to the programme in 2011 are still following older Business Management programme version while 1<sup>st</sup> year student have been studying according to the new plan.

The explanation for changing the course title was to differentiate in a fierce national competition (the evidence for this can be read in the Self-Assessment Report, and was also communicated during the field visit.

The current situation on the Lithuanian higher education Business/management MSc market is quite complex:

- there are 177 registered state graduate and post-graduate programs titled “management”, so the supply side seem to be overcrowded and the competition for students is fierce;
- on the demand side employers expect graduates with high quality and practicable knowledge, and there is an extremely strong take-up effect on the labor market with a mutually strong intention of both parties: employers try to catch students during their studies as soon as possible on the one hand, and students want to be employed as soon as possible to ensure the best possible market position;
- therefore students (especially on the Master level) strongly require “quasi part-time” program structure, meaning studying beside full time job engagement.

This complex situation put an extreme burden on the management Master programs, as the requirements above are almost in trade-off relationship with each other in any couples chosen.

Program designers have a simon-pure dilemma, whether:

- to offer the highest academic standards and content to keep-up with the fierce competition; or
- compromise the content with the limited time frame of a “quasi part-time” program.

From market point of view compromising is not just understandable, but it is almost a must to keep on foot, from academic point of view it is yet a dilemma, what is the level of compromise a program (and a higher education institute behind it) can afford.

The major dilemma of the accreditation expert team was the following:

- understanding the market pressure to be sympathetic with the academic compromises; or
- as guardians of academic standards presage the risks of above compromises, and express warning of approaching the minimum academic standards of a master level programme.

## II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

### *1. Programme aims and learning outcomes*

Vilnius University MSc programme in *Development of Organisations* is a new master programme amongst 177 registered state graduate and post-graduate programs titled “management”. With a resolute intention of differentiating in this fierce national competition, Vilnius University’s Faculty of Economics reshaped and renamed its older “Business Management” MSc programme, with reformulated aims.

The aims of the program are parsimoniously set forth in Lithuanian (<http://www.vu.lt/kviecia/rinkis-studijas/ka-studijuoti/2-pakopos-studiju-programos/item/241#profesin%C4%97s-veiklos-galimyb%C4%97s>) and could not be sought out in English.

The aims of the program are, anyway, extensively formulated in the Self Assessment Report. These aims are clear and ambitious.

The most important differentiating aims set out in Self-Assessment Report (SAR) are as follows:

- “The primary aim is to develop general understanding how companies are operating and developing their activities within different functional areas and depending on a kind of activities. Based on this aim students can develop more specific skills linked to some particular organizational issues.” (p.6.)
- *Development of Organisations* programme aims to develop generic and specific competences. The key generic competences include:
  - Ability of abstract thinking, ability to analyse independently and systemise information on organisational development;
  - Ability to independently apply theoretical knowledge by critically analysing and creatively solving business problems, ability to formulate ideas and proposals.

Within the programme study process two types of specific competences are developed: those which are attributed to the whole programme and those which are attributed to a specific area of interest. (p.7.)

- “This Master study programme is focused towards persons who graduated in other than business studies; however they have plentiful personal managerial experience.” (p.6.)
- “... orientation toward MBA type business studies programmes” (p.5.)

The résumé phrasing of the aims is the following:

***“The aim of the study programme of Organisational Development is to train wide profile and highly qualified professionals, who in practice are working as managers or specialists, able to develop activities of an entire organization and its separate functional areas.”*** (p.6.)

The programme is divided into three alternative choices of packages of elective courses: strategic development of organizations, marketing management, and financial accounting and auditing. These are non-registered specializations<sup>1</sup> of the programme, however *unofficially are called specializations*.

The three “unofficial specializations” have their specific aims as well:

- “The key aim of the ***Strategic Development of Organisations*** specialization is to provide managers and specialists with necessary competences in the area of development and implementation of generic and functional strategies. Strategic Development of Organisations specialization is created for highest rank managers, representatives of governing bodies (board members of joint stock companies or state companies) as well as specialists who implement functions of strategic development of organisations. However the specialization is focused on small organisations, where due to their size there is no specialized and developed functional divisions dedicated for managerial, analytical activities to be performed, when their managers on their own or in small teams have to adopt decisions in all major areas of activity.” (p.6.) These aims formulated seem to be somewhat self-contradictory! The strategic perspective and responsibility of the board members of

---

<sup>1</sup> The registered specializations do not exist due to legal requirements. But the requirements for Master degree studies allow to have up to 30 credits for elective, practical training or other subjects, which are needed to achieve program aims.

large companies and the skills of a ubiquitous problem solver of a small business manager cannot be properly trained under the same umbrella!

- “The key aim of the *Marketing Management* specialization is to train competent highest and middle rank marketing specialists able to properly understand dynamics of environmental factors and to manage adequately marketing activities of an organization. Marketing Management specialization is created for training of middle and highest rank marketing specialists able to work in business companies, public institutions as well as state sector.” (p.7.)
- “The key aim of the *Financial Accounting and Audit* specialization is to provide specialists with systemic competences in the areas of financial accounting, financial accountability, independent and internal audit. Financial Accounting and Audit specialization is created for training of highly competent financial accounting and audit specialists, who could be employed in various types of institutions, manage accounting, perform audit, assess and forecast activities of an organization. A *Financial Accounting and Audit* graduate could be employed in companies and public sector institutions as a chief accountant, head of internal audit division, consultant; the person will be able to pursue independent auditor’s license or work as a manager in a state institution.” (p.7.)

This set of aims of the programme determines both its strength and its vulnerability. There is no doubts that all the aims listed above are responses to actual practical business challenges, however, the experts would cast doubt on the variances of these aims, and express concerns about the ability to achieve all of them at an appropriate level, especially not with non-business bachelor foundations.

Meeting with students, both graduates and currently involved in the programme, underpinned the recognition, anyway, that students self-identification is clearly being specialist, none of them regarded themselves as generalists. On the other hand **the experts** could not find evidence of the substantive mid-management rank experience in the students body, that is necessary to a (would-be) MBA programme.

Some of the ambiguities are:

- MBA-like programmes are to train generalist top managers from experienced mid-managers, who are salient specialists. Although it is not impossible to combine generalist *and* specialist training, the right balance is extremely important. Pursuing for both focuses may result in “fall between two stools”. Training experts to “functional carrer path” and at the same time general managers who are able to see through functions (cross-functional approach) in their complexity and integrate large organizational systems, seems to be oriented in divergent directions. It has also a whole bunch of curricular and course content consequences.
- The three (unofficial) specialization seem to train professionals to quite different sectors. There could be doubts about the spread of the foundation courses in the first two semesters (being able to equally support rudiments for SMEs, public institutions, state sector, and consultancy);
- Trying to attract students with non-business bachelor degrees can be a viable option if the focus of the program is general management, but it may run a risk of highly trained specialists (especially in the case of finances and audit) without a solid professional foundation.
- It may be the aim “training board members of joint stock companies or state companies” i smore appropriate to the next level of study cycle?
- There is some ambiguity about the label Organizational Development as it is used in the SAR. The experts are aware of the fact, that in the Central-Eastern-European economics/business vocabulary some words have special connotation (different from the one of the Western business and academic communities). Organizational Development is an es-

established and more-or-less clearly defined<sup>2</sup> field of study and practice, mostly based upon the principle of developing organizations through developing the problem-solving people. In this respect the tool-box of OD (beside action planning and action learning) includes a great variety of soft analytical and problem solving tools. Looking into the SAR document it is clearly not the “soft notion” of developing organizations, rather closer to the sense of more instrumental *Organizational design*. One familiar with the Western notion of OD cannot find the soft courses (like *Action research*). This programme title may help in differentiating from competing Lithuanian programmes, however, it might cause some confusion in the understanding of Western minded stakeholders (employers, peer academic institutions, etc.).

Besides the legal compliances, there seem to be no risk that the programme might turn out to be inadequate to business community needs or the labor market. Regardless of the aforementioned ambiguities the well established and publicized programme content complies with the requirements of companies, employers. An important strength of the programme is its regional leadership position, and its reputation in business, public, and state sector communities. The study programme seems to make use of feedback from its Master degree alumni, and relies on conclusions made by other stakeholders: management experts, business people and high rank managers.

### ***Main strengths and weaknesses***

#### **Strengths**

Historically strong regional leadership position and reputation.

#### **Weaknesses**

Relatively widely spreading set of aims (and sub-aims).

The differentiating effect of the revision perhaps not radical enough to clearly reorient.

Lack of international exposure in the program.

## ***2. Curriculum design***

The curriculum design of the programme meets legal requirements formulated by Descriptor of General Requirements for Master’s Degree Study Programmes (Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania No. V-826, adopted on June 3, 2010). The total volume of the study programme is supposed to be between 90 and 120 ECTS: this programme provides 120 ECTS. According to the regulation minimum of 60 ECTS should be devoted to the study field area: this programme consists of exactly 60 ECTS; and maximum of 30 ECTS to elective courses: this programme offers 18 ECTS of this sort. Finally at least 30 ECTS should be devoted to the master thesis: the credits of Final thesis project I-III. in this programme are 42 ECTS.

Taking into account the aforementioned strengths and weaknesses in the programme overall (ambiguities in the programme aims and learning outcomes), it is necessary to consider the related consequences embedded in the curriculum design itself. It has been noted that the programme aims seem to fluctuate between general and specialized focus.

Translating that into curriculum structure design the structure of the programme is based on a few clear principles: “The conception of the area of the programme structure is based on the principles of succession and continuity: general managerial and general economic knowledge,

---

<sup>2</sup> Theory and practice of planned, systematic change in the attitudes, beliefs, and values of the employees through creation and reinforcement of long-term training programs. OD is action oriented. It starts with a careful organization-wide analysis of the current situation and of the future requirements, and employs techniques of behavioral sciences such as behavior modeling, sensitivity training, and transactional analysis. Its objective is to enable the organization in adopting-better to the fast-changing external environment of new markets, regulations, and technologies.

acquired in preparatory studies and with the working experience compose basis for forming knowledge representing target development of organizations systems. It is assumed that it is essential to maintain harmony of key business activities and management functions resolution in the study process. The second aim of the programme concept is to properly balance knowledge on external and internal organizational environments. The third aim is focused on development of organization managers / specialists informational and analytical competence.” (p.11.)

The first two semesters offer the common foundation studies, 3<sup>rd</sup> semester is focused on specialisations, and the last (4<sup>th</sup>) semester fully devoted to thesis work. The first three semesters have an identical structure: 4 obligatory courses of 6 credits each, plus an elective course chosen from a basket of four subjects. All semesters are equally weighed as 30 credits load each.

The balanced internal/external focus aim seems to be met in the course composition. However, it seems, that half of the ground courses seem to be rather root-subjects of the three specialization that general management foundation:

- Instruments of financial accounting,
- Relation between an organization and its market,
- Strategic management,
- Audit theory and practice),

.In a programme with a broad aim of training general managers (especially MBA-like) would-be general managers may miss core courses such as Operations management, Supply chain management and/or Logistics, Human Resources Management. Also Management course (or courses: Organisation Design, Leadership, Motivation, Management control) would have been well received.

Concerning the specialisations (3<sup>rd</sup> semester) one may look for the sector specifics (SMEs in the case of *Strategic Development of Organisations* specialization; public institutions and state sector in the case of *Marketing Management* specialization; and public sector institutions, state institution and consultancy in the case of *Financial Accounting and Audit* specialization) mentioned in the specialization aims in the previous chapter. The course materials might include and cover those specifics, but the course titles and the course outlines don't say so.

Probably the most unusual feature of the programme is the extensive stretching of self-learning. The first three semesters (30 credits each) consist of course units with an identical workload-structure for each:

Academic work type	Academic work load (hours)	%
Lectures	12	7,69%
consultation	6	3,85%
self learning	138	88,46%
Total:	156	100,00%

As a consequence the total workload of a semester (but the 4<sup>th</sup>) looks like this:

Academic work type	Academic work load (hours)
lectures	60
consultation	30
self learning	690
Total:	780

That is: no seminars at all and not more, than 12% of the total hours are contact hours (lectures and consultations). It is at least unusual, especially in the case of a full-time program. The semester is scheduled bi-weekly: contact hours are arranged every other Saturday. On the one hand, from market pressure point of view this is one of the major lure for the program (the meeting



with the students unequivocally confirmed this) –, on the other hand from academic standards point this puts serious limitation on the efficiency of knowledge transfer.

Taking into consideration this structure of work-load the experts have some serious concerns:

- This structure does not provide much opportunity for team-work;
- Although since Mintzberg's seminal research findings it is a stereotypic management fact that this profession is by nature verbal, this work-load structure does not let too much opportunity for verbal communication and exam.
- Problem solving competences may be developed through common problem-oriented thinking, confront different approaches, exploring synergies stemming from different ways of thinking, and concluding in a mutually accepted problem-solving. This work-load structure does not allow too much opportunity for this type of experiential learning.
- It is also a widely accepted recognition (especially in the case of MBA-like), that one of the sources of learning (besides written material and instructor's lecture) is the experience of course participants. This work-load structure does not let too much opportunity for learning from each other's lessons.

Instead, the program emphasizes the importance of research, and offering strong assistance and support for carrying out four researches (three in the first three semesters, and the thesis work, as the last, major one). Research is a good way of develop analytical skills, and systemic tools for problem solving, however, research work may rather develop specific skills and problem solving, and not generic ones! Besides, research work may help to understand and improve local and regional problems, but hardly give inputs to learn about international best practices and benchmarks (unless extensive number of international research topics).

The dominant language of education is Lithuanian, although English language courses and lectures may be organized upon request.

The Thesis work preparation process is carefully designed.

### ***Main strengths and weaknesses***

#### **Strengths**

Strong focus and emphasis on practical research.

#### **Weaknesses**

Limitations in developing important general management skills and competences like team-work, verbal skills, cooperative problem solving, resolving conflicts, building and maintaining trust.

Limited international exposure.

Not all the specializations and electives are necessarily available.

Relatively diverse and uneven background and motivation of the students.

Lack of practicing English language in action.

Insufficient inputs to encourage and shepherd students toward the Ph.D. programme.

### ***3. Teaching staff***

The staffing is adequate to ensure implementation of the learning outcomes of the programme. Without any doubt, the teaching staff represents the highest competence in the field of Management. They are appointed through competitive selection process with an appraisal, every 5 years.

All the 26 programme faculty members (who are responsible not just for courses, but Thesis work supervising as well) are habilitated and/or doctors, out of them 14 professors, 10 associate professors, and 2 lecturers; this is well above the 80% legal requirement. Also, the requirement that not less than 20 percent of the study area subjects should be taught by professors is fully satisfied (about 70 percent). The majority of teachers know 2-3 foreign languages; however some lecturers know even more foreign languages. They are from different Departments of FE, and some of them came from other Faculties of VU, or from other HE Institutions. Majority of the teachers also teach in other study programmes of the VU FE and work with students of all three levels of studies.

Teachers' research and teaching material development are in compliance with their taught study subject. Almost all the teachers have produced textbooks, teaching materials or courses for distance learning. 45 publications of this type have been prepared in the last 5 years. The teaching staff mobilized to teach on this program seems to be exceptionally strong.

The research and publication records of the faculty members are visible and meet the highest Lithuanian standards, including numerous international publications and research grant participations.

The teacher/student ratio reported in SAR is really excellent: 1:4,1! However, it is worthwhile to mention that if we apply the international way of calculating this ratio it is much higher since teachers are not employed full time in this programme but share their teaching load is shared among various undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. Still, even calculating with the FTE (full-time equivalent) measure, the ratio meets the requirements.

The turnover rate of the faculty seems to be steady, causing no risks or negative impacts to the programme.

The age structure of the Faculty is matured, but not ageing. 50% are above 56 years old, out of them 3 are above 65. The 35-45 age cohort is represented by 9 professors, with no younger faculty members. According to experience meeting the faculty members, the faculty members of the highest age cohort seem to represent an earlier, outworn paradigm of science and teaching. Students have expressed some concern over the teaching ability of some teachers.

The members of a strongly staffed program faculty does not necessarily utilize synergies as a cohesive team. Rather they contribute, on high level, as individuals.

Albeit speaking several languages and being involved in international projects, quite a few teachers of the programme take part in the academic exchange and teach abroad.

Although the level of experience required is a strong expectation, faculty development by involving and training younger faculty members would enhance long-term strategic stability of the programme. Yet, university salaries are not competitive enough to safely keep the best talents against the tempting business challenges.

### ***Main strengths and weaknesses***

#### **Strengths**

Excellent faculty with the highest business and academic reputation and acknowledgements.

#### **Weaknesses**

Lack of team ethos and practice.

### ***4. Facilities and learning resources***

The facilities for the implementation of the programme are sufficient both in their size and quality. Technical resources are sufficient, although development and updating is rather slow.

Number and structure of computer background (both hardware, and software) foster achieving learning outcomes.

The sources of the newly developed library (physical and electronic) unquestionably offer the necessary background for learning and research. The text-books, teaching materials, necessary data-bases are steadily available.

The only concern about the facilities is that the fully scheduled by-weekly Saturday visits may leave limited time frame for students to actually utilize these really valuable resources. One of the conclusion from meetings with students is that they mostly communicate and obtain sources rather through Moodle than the well mounted library. So, from potential side it is excellent, from actual using perspective it is just good (under-utilized).

### **Strengths**

Very good facilities meeting high international standards.

## ***5. Study process and students' performance assessment***

The admission requirements had been reduced: the competitive score till 2009 was formed on the basis of the undergraduate's Diploma Supplement data *and* entrance exam results. After 2009 the *entrance exam was abandoned* and since then the competitive score has been formed only on the main results of the studies of the Diploma Supplement. The program organizes bridging courses for BA graduates from other fields. They provide these type of courses (marketing, management, ect) up to 40 credits.

There are no state financed places in this programme, but the competition still higher than in the state-funded study programmes. The average competition score of the applicants has been constantly increasing, but due to financial situation in crisis the number of applicants has decreased. First priority applicants are typically from one-third to one-fourth of the total applications. The lack of state financed places, anyway, raises some concerns to be addressed in the future.

Although opportunity would be there, mobility programmes are not particularly popular among programme participants because of work and family background reasons. However, VU FE receives mobility students (mostly Erasmus) in great number (70 students in 2010/2011).

The institutions and the vehicles of student support seem to be satisfactory to help students to achieve expected programme outcomes. Students can reach professors quite flexibly via Skype or mobile phone calls. Student reported professors are available to communicate willingly, and almost real time.

Placement data after graduation are convincing, according to a 2012 survey only 2 graduates were unemployed (2012), mostly finding jobs (or getting promoted into more senior positions at the current organization) with prestigious companies or institutions.

Ethical conduct and systems are well established, defended Thesis are publicized, plagiarism check system installed and used.

Student assessment is exclusively based on written assignments, tests, and exams, evaluated on 1 to 10 scale and cumulatively translated into grades by the course instructor. Evaluation criteria is clarified in course unit descriptions in detailed and transparently. According to the evidence of course unit descriptions the weight of final written exams in course evaluation range from 60% to 100%, the rest is written tests on by-weekly classes. This pattern leaves limited room for continuous learning on the one hand, and tend to be rather [encyclopaedic](#), that problem oriented.

The major vehicle for assignments and assessments is Moodle.

Feed-back about the grades is quite technical: scores, points communicated quickly and accurately, however, feedback about how to improve, is negligible.

Final theses defense panel consist of 5 to 6 persons, including members from social partners.

The amended programme has no graduates as yet so comment on graduation statistics would be inappropriate.

### *Main strengths and weaknesses*

#### **Strengths**

Clear assessment criteria

#### **Weaknesses**

Only written and mostly [encyclopaedic](#) exams

## **6. Programme management**

The formal system of managing program is well established. The Programme Committee (accountable to the Faculty Council) has been established for monitoring, measuring and supervising the implementation and continuous development of study programme. It is managed by the Head of the Departments of Management and also involves other members of the Department and peer Departments, social partners and representatives of the students. Essential revisions and improvements are considered and decided by the Faculty Council, and approved by VU Study Directorate, Senate Committees, and Rector's Office. However, having the first year of the program (no graduates so far!) these revisions and improvements had no historical records yet.

All the information related to the study process (the outcomes of the admission, exam session results, academic leaves, suspension of studies, resumption of studies, etc.), as well as to students, academic staff, and administration, has been recorded by the FE in the VU information system since 1992 in the order prescribed by the VU internal procedures. Teachers and students have direct access to all the necessary information related to the taught or taken course.

Yet, due to late publicizing the lists of the admitted students VU had lost some applicants, who applied to more HEIs parallel.

Both in the autumn and spring terms, the VU Quality Management Centre conducts student satisfaction survey. Class averages (on a scale from 1 to 5) are as follows: timetable (4,49 - the majority of students are against both increase of study time in auditoriums and teamwork assignments); auditorium suitability (4,44); teachers' professionalism and knowledge (4,29); teachers behaviour and benevolence (4,57). The usefulness, quality of topics preparation and sufficiency of study materials for studies were rated above the average (3,79; 3,74 and 3,90; respectively). Meeting with students and graduates confirmed that they are satisfied with the program, however, some of them traced back their satisfaction to the fact of "Saturday concentration". They also expressed that they may have channels of formal and informal voice, if needed.

Social partners are involved in both Programme Committee, and Master Thesis evaluation committees.

The experts' most important concern about managing program is the means (more exactly the lack of means) for controlling independent working. The experts could not find any ways (neither in the SAR, nor during our meetings) of formally tracing how students use their

individual working time. The only reported way of checking it is the tests on the concentration Saturdays, so it is control through results, but there seems to be no control over the process. Taking into consideration of the extended credits (and time frame) allocated to self-learning, this level of control does not seem sufficient. The risk of “lightweight” credit is not negligible. Students’ self-assessment of how much time do they spend with self-learning daily, was 1-3 hours per day. And they said: “It’s enough”.

The expert panel’s sturdy conviction that a closer control over self-studying is necessary. In the international higher education systems there is a range of workload required to earn a credit, this range spreads from 25 to 30 hours/per credit. Therefore a 30 credits semester is equivalent of total 750 to 900 hours work. The *Development of Organisation* program consists of 780 hours (30 credits) per semester<sup>3</sup>, and allocates a total of 690 hours to self-learning (uniformly 138 hours per course per semester). With a full-time work obligation a systematic, orderly learning of average 1-3 hours daily is highly unrealistic (even if we assume predominance of week-end learning, except every other Saturday of contact teaching). Still, if it is done, it is still pretty far from 690 hours per semester. Consequently, we may conclude recognizing either “lightweight” credits, or insufficient workload behind the credits. Both seem to be problem.

#### ***Main strengths and weaknesses***

##### **Strengths**

Formal program management systems are well-established

##### **Weaknesses**

Weak control over self studying.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1. Revise the programme aims, objectives and learning outcomes to reflect more accurately the right balance of generic and specific management competences. Realistically reduce the diversified set of aims.
- 3.2. Increase the symmetry of (general) management courses within the program.
- 3.3. Explore ways of increasing the role of English in the teaching and learning experience of the students, and enhance international flavor of the program.
- 3.4. Extend the students’ oral (verbal communication) elements in both teaching and exams.
- 3.5. Increase the proportion of the contact hours.
- 3.6. Develop a system of closer control over self-learning.

---

<sup>3</sup> that is: 26 hours per credit

#### IV. SUMMARY

The programme aims and learning outcomes are somewhat overstated: developing in parallel expert specialist, and general management skills is overly ambitious, and hardly can be delivered in the contact time frame given. Besides, students' self-identity is almost exclusively "expertise", not general management. The articulate marketing purpose (being attractive and competitive) of ambitious and diversified aims is not justifiable neither from demand (students expectations), nor from supply (quality knowledge transfer during contact hours) side. It would be helpful for the programme team to revisit the statement of objectives and learning outcomes with a view to bringing them more clearly into line with the undoubted qualities of the programme faculty on the one hand, and the special labour market situation on the other hand. A sharpe-faced internationalizing the programme is indispensable in the long run.

The content of the modules is consistent with Master level studies. The content and methods of the modules are, anyway, satisfying mostly the achievement of the intended learning outcomes related to expertise development, and somewhat void related to general management content and skills. The most important vulnerability of the program is the excess weight of self-studying. Regardless how much is it attractive from marketing point of view, the cost the programme should pay on the academic concession side, is hardly acceptable. The quality of staff expertise makes it possible to answer all kinds of market challenges, the crucial point is the right balance between market expectations and academic standards. Another important improvement field is a stronger internationalization of the content of courses and increased role of English in the delivery of the curriculum.

The staff who provide the programme meet legal requirements. They are appointed and appraised according to VU requirements, which are designed to maintain a high quality of teaching provision. Staff are heavily involved in research, in active engagement in real world management, in a wide range of personal staff development activities and in active membership of international academic organizations. They have the expertise and experience to deliver a wide range of topics in management. By all measures the general standard of teaching is good. Students have, however, expressed some concern over the teaching ability of some teachers. The age profile is such that the Faculty faces no immediate problem of significant staff changes. However, a farseeing faculty development plan (both young-making, and teaching methods enhancement) can increase the delivery power of the programme to an even higher level. The faculty recruited from different departments need to improve their efforts to act as a team, even better utilizing synergies.

The facilities (library, teaching rooms, electronic equipment, online resources), are good. The treasury is there, the only concern is the shortage of students' time to actually exploit it.

The admission requirements have been reduced: the competitive score has been formed only on the main results of the studies of the Diploma Supplement. The number of applicants decreased, yet the average competition score of the applicants has been somewhat increasing. There are no state financed places in this programme – this can be a good news and a warning at the same time. Staff student communication is excellent, making full use of the ambitious VU information system. Students' remote support is immediate and adequate. Student assessment is exclusively based on written assignments, tests, and exams, that moderately supports the aims and learning outcomes of the programme. Students get immediate and adequate information about their achievements, which still leaves room to feeding-back ways of improvements. The mobility of the students is quite limited (due to their lack of time available).

Measures for quality assurance and quality enhancement, both formal and informal, involving all stakeholders inside and outside the Institution, are appropriate. Procedures for using

feedback in the developing of learning outcomes, curriculum and assessment are formerly established, but as yet have no historical records.

The Achilles' heel of the programme management is the loose control of self-learning, that jeopardize either “lightweight” credits, or insufficient workload behind the credits. Relying fully on students’ work-out of 690 hours of self-studying framework is, at least, risky (both from academic and professional point of view). Without a thorough system of dogging and evaluating how students use the 90% of their qualification time programme might hazard its integrity.

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Development of Organizations* (state code – 621N20008) of Vilnius University is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	2
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>14</b>

\*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:

Hilyer, Roger

Grupės nariai:  
Team members:

Bakacsi, Gyula

Dahlgaard-Park, Su Mi

Day, Guenther

Ipsilandis, Pandelis G.

Mazonaviciute, Ingrida



&lt;...&gt;

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Vilniaus universiteto studijų programa *Organizacijų vystymas* (valstybinis kodas – 621N20008) vertinama teigiamai.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	<b>Iš viso:</b>	<b>14</b>

\* 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**

Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai yra šiek tiek perdėti: lygiagretus specialistų ir bendrųjų vadybos įgūdžių ugdymas yra pernelyg ambicingas, ir vargu ar gali būti įvykdytas per numatytą laiką. Be to, studentų savarankiškumas yra gaunamas patirties dėka, o ne dėl bendrosios vadybos. Aiškus ambicingų ir diversifikuotų tikslų rinkodaros tikslas (būti patrauklesniu ir konkurencingesniu) yra nepateisinamas nei iš paklausos (studentų lūkesčiai), nei iš pasiūlos pusės (kokybiškų žinių perteikimas kontaktinių valandų metu). Programos komandai būtų naudinga persvarstyti keliamus tikslus ir studijų rezultatus, siekiant suderinti juos su neabejotiniais programos kolektyvo privalumais ir specialia darbo rinkos situacija. Programos internacionalizacija yra būtina žvelgiant į ateitį.

Modulių turinys atitinka magistro lygio studijas. Modulių turinys ir metodai labiausiai orientuoti į numatomų studijų rezultatų, susijusių su kompetencijos vystymu, siekimą, bet labai susiję su bendrosios vadybos turiniu ir įgūdžiais. Didžiausias programos trūkumas yra pernelyg didelis savarankiškų studijų kiekis. Nepriklausomai nuo to, kiek programa patraukli rinkodaros požiūriu, kaina, kurią programa turėtų sumokėti už akademinę koncesijos dalį, nėra labai priimtina. Darbuotojų kompetencijos kokybė leidžia atremti visus rinkos iššūkius, ir ypač svarbu, kad būtų teisinga pusiausvyra tarp rinkos lūkesčių ir akademinų standartų. Kitas svarbus patobulinimas yra stipresnė dalykų turinio internacionalizacija ir padidėjęs anglų kalbos vaidmuo studijų programoje.

Programoje dėstantys dėstytojai atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus. Jie yra skiriami ir vertinami pagal VU reikalavimus, siekiant išlaikyti aukštą studijų kokybę. Dėstytojai aktyviai dalyvauja moksliniuose tyrimuose, yra aktyvūs vadybos srityje, įsitraukę į personalo kvalifikacijos kėlimo veiklas, bei dalyvauja tarptautinėse akademinėse organizacijose. Jie turi pakankamai žinių ir patirties, kad galėtų pristatyti įvairias vadybos temas. Bendras dėstymo standartas, pagal visas priemones, yra geras. Tačiau studentai išreiškė susirūpinimą dėl kai kurių dėstytojų gebė-

jimo dėstyti. Amžiaus profilis yra toks, kad fakultetas susiduria su netiesiogine personalo kaitos problema. Tačiau išvalgus fakulteto plėtros planas (ir jaunimo ugdymo, ir studijų metodų tobulinimo) gali gerokai pagerinti programos dėstymą. Dėstytojai, įdarbinami iš skirtingų departamentų, turėtų padidinti pastangas veikti kaip komanda, geriau išnaudojant sinergiją.

Studijų ištekliai (biblioteka, mokymo kambariai, elektroninė įranga, interneto ištekliai) yra tinkami. Taigi, ištekliai yra, vienintelis rūpestis yra studentų laiko, skirto tikram jo išnaudojimui, trūkumas.

Priėmimo reikalavimai buvo sumažinti: konkursinis balas buvo sudarytas tik iš pagrindinių diplomo priedo rezultatų. Kandidatų skaičius sumažėjo, tačiau vidutinis kandidatų konkurencijos rezultatas šiek tiek padidėjo. Šioje programoje nėra valstybės finansuojamų vietų - tai gali būti gera žinia ir tuo pačiu metu įspėjimas. Darbuotojų ir studentų bendravimas yra puikus, visapusiškai panaudojant VU informacines sistemas. Studentams teikiama nuotolinė pagalba yra skubi ir adekvati. Studentų vertinimas grindžiamas tik užduotimis raštu, testais ir egzaminais, kas palaiko programos studijų tikslus. Studentai gauna greitą ir adekvačią informaciją apie jų pasiekimus, paliekant vietos tobulėjimui. Studentų mobilumas yra gana ribotas (dėl jų turimo laiko stokos).

Priemonės, skirtos kokybės užtikrinimui ir gerinimui, tiek formalios, tiek neformalios, įtraukiant visas suinteresuotąsias šalis organizacijos viduje ir už jos ribų, yra tinkamos. Grįžtamąjo ryšio naudojimo tvarka, plėtojant studijų rezultatus, studijų programą ir vertinimą, yra jau anksčiau nustatyta, tačiau apie tai nėra jokių įrašų.

Programos valdymo „Achilo kulnas“ yra laisva savarankiškų studijų kontrolė, kuri kelia pavojų arba „lengvinti“ kreditus, arba sudaro sąlygas nepakankamam darbo krūviui už kreditus. Visiškai remtis studentų darbu, kurį sudaro 690 savarankiško studijavimo programos valandos, yra rizikinga tiek akademinio, tiek profesinio požiūriu. Be nuodugnios vertinimo sistemos kaip studentai išnaudoja 90% savo studijoms skirtą laiką, gali kilti pavojus programos vientisumui.

### **III. REKOMENDACIJOS**

3.1. Peržiūrėti programos tikslus, uždavinius ir studijų rezultatus, siekiant tiksliau atspindėti tinkamą pusiausvyrą tarp bendrųjų ir specialiųjų vadybos kompetencijų. Realistiškai sumažinti diversifikuotus tikslus.

3.2. Padidinti bendrųjų vadybos dalykų pusiausvyrą programoje.

3.3. Ieškoti būdų, kaip padidinti anglų kalbos vaidmenį mokyme ir mokymesi, ir stiprinti programos tarptautiškumą.

3.4. Išplėsti studentų atsiskaitymą žodžiu mokymo procese egzaminuose.

3.5. Padidinti kontaktinių valandų skaičių.

3.6. Plėtoti kontrolės sistemą savarankiškam mokymuisi.

<...>

---