



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

SPORTO UNIVERSITETO  
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *TURISMO IR SPORTO VADYBA*  
(*valstybinis kodas - 621N90001*)  
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

---

EVALUATION REPORT  
OF *TOURISM AND SPORTS MANAGEMENT* (*state code -*  
*621N90001*)  
STUDY PROGRAMME  
at LITHUANIAN SPORTS UNIVERSITY

**Experts' team:**

1. **Dr. Mary Lyn Glanz (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. Eneken Titov,** *academic,*
3. **Mr. Henri Kuokkanen,** *academic,*
4. **Mr. Linas Pučinskas,** *representative of social partners'*
5. **Ms. Indrė Šareikaitė,** *students' representative.*

**Evaluation coordinator -**

*Ms Gabriele Bajorinaite*

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language – English

Vilnius  
2015

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Turizmo ir sporto vadyba</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621N90001
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Verslas ir vadyba
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (1,5); Iššęstinės (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	90
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Verslo ir vadybos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2006-12-29

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Tourism and sports Management</i>
State code	621N90001
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Business and Administrative Studies
Type of the study programme	University
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	90
Volume of the study programme in credits	Full-time (1.5); part-time (2 )
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Business and Administrative Studies
Date of registration of the study programme	29 December, 2006

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

# CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
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
<b>II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2.2. Curriculum design .....	7
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 * .....	13
<b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT.....</b>	<b>16</b>

## 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 Lithuanian Sports University (LSU) is located in Kaunas, and this report focuses on the second cycle study programme Tourism and Sports management delivered by the Faculty of Sports Education. Student enrolment has been steady during the review period of 2011-2015 with around 60 students on this programme. The university vision and mission include a strong

commitment toward Europe, and this aspect is clearly evident in the memberships of professional networks the university has.

The programme was last evaluated in 2009 with a full six year accreditation given to the programme. The previous report commended the university on several areas while providing recommendations for further development particularly in the internationalisation of the programme and upgrading of facilities. These recommendations were taken into account during the evaluation. In 2014 admissions on the part-time study programme were closed and all students are now enrolled as full-time, with distance learning options and flexibility over class schedules offered to compensate for this change. It has also renewed its credits system in 2011 to match new national standards and gain compatibility with the ECTS, approved by the Senate in 2012.

The faculty of Sport Education, part of the LSU, offers four undergraduate and 3 master's programmes. Research is focused on five strategic areas, with sports industry management and economics connected with the programme. Since the last visit, the university has changed its name from Lithuanian Academy of Physical Education to LSU.

#### **1.4. The Review Team**

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. 1-01-151 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *10/May/2016*.

1. **Dr. Mary Lyn Glanz (team leader)** retired from Dean of Graduate Studies of Glion Institute of Higher Education and Bulle and Les Roches-Gruyère University of Applied Sciences, UK.
2. **Prof. Eneken Titov**, vice rector for academic affairs and professor Estonian Entrepreneurship University of Applied Sciences, Estonia.
3. **Mr. Henri Kuokkanen**, Research Fellow and Online MBA Program Coordinator at Glion Institute of Higher Education, Switzerland.
4. **Mr. Linas Pucinskas**, Managing director, founder, co-owner of the restaurant "Verkiiai", Lithuania.
5. **Indre Sareikaite**, student of Vilnius College study programme Business Economics, Lithuania.

## **II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS**

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

The pre-visit documentation opens by tying the mission of the programme with the Lithuania 2030 national development strategy, and the national sport development strategy. The programme is consistent with the relevant acts of the country. The programme aims and learning outcomes are split into general and subject specific competencies, and demonstrate compatibility

with the relevant quality descriptors. Attention is paid on research skills which is fully in line with a second cycle degree. To emphasize the need for applied research one outcome is dedicated to consulting activities; this reflects the needs of the jobs market well. Outcomes are clear and communicated through a variety of media, increasing the transparency of the programme.

The programme aims and learning outcomes are appropriately connected with the all the stakeholders of the university. Alumni and social partners commend the practically oriented studies in the programme as preparing students well for the requirements of the labour market. A special note was made by the social partners to keep tourism as part of the programme for its importance in the region. Social partners seem properly immersed in the development of the aims and outcomes ensuring future labour market compatibility.

In the pre-visit documentation the authors note that the programme aims to develop students for sports and leisure sectors, “basing their training on the achievements of fundamental and applied interdisciplinary science and technology, in order to produce personalities who possess a comprehensive education, ethical responsibility, creative and enterprising qualities and who are capable of developing business and activities of sports and tourism organizations in a creative manner, carrying out applied research and of applying research findings in daily activities of an organization, as well as in adopting strategic decisions“. These points are highly relevant and connection between them and the practices of the institution was clear. Examples include the university ethics policy that was recognised throughout the programme and its students, and the inclusion of neuroscience in the curriculum to highlight the interdisciplinary nature of the studies. These aims are appropriate for this programme and they particularly emphasise the development of managerial and research skills as expected at this level of studies. The aim of the programme was well reflected during the visit in interviews with various stakeholders.

Overall, the name of the programme reflects the content and is compatible with the qualification offered. The second cycle study programme is coherent and contributes well to the university’s vision and mission with delivery of the programme in English and Lithuanian, and with ample other opportunities to connect students and faculty with larger European sports management education and practise. The pre-visit documentation highlights the need for continuous updating of the aims and outcomes and proposes a survey to support this work. Recognising this need is commendable and progressing with this initiative is recommended. A future plan to start an international study programme is also encouraged.

## ***2.2. Curriculum design***

The curriculum of the programme follows appropriate rules and regulations and it is ECTS compatible since approval in 2012: 90 credits of the volume of the programme, more than 60 ECTS are dedicated for the study field subjects, 5 subjects are taken during the semester and etc. The credits are spread evenly across the programme and research methodology teaching is started during the first semester leading up to the thesis, subjects are consistent with the type and level of the studies. Research is heavily weighted with two research methods modules during the first 2 semester (5 ECTS each) and the final thesis of 30 ECTS. This investment on research is clearly evident in the notable research focus of the students, discussed later in this Report.

The learning outcomes of the modules are set at an appropriate level of graduate skills and the courses backed up with sources generally reflecting latest and up-to-date knowledge in the field. The only exception to this seemed to be the module Organizational Management in Sport and Tourism, where some sources seem a bit dated. Obviously these could be highly relevant to the topic and their use may be well-justified, but this should be verified. In the meeting with the Panel students highlighted the up-to-date nature of the knowledge they receive. The learning verbs used are mostly appropriate, though expressions such as “think analytically and critically” as an outcome would become clearer if rephrased as “to analyse and criticize”. This may merely reflect the translation from Lithuanian to English, but, as an example, the assessment of the outcomes of “analysis” are much easier to assess than the thinking process leading to the analysis.

Projects where students act as consultants to solve problems for businesses are employed in the programme and this is commendable. However, based on the student feedback it seemed that these projects are not real-life problems but made up for the courses. Obviously securing an adequate number of commissioned projects to run the modules each semester may be challenging, but offering projects based on real business cases would elevate the learning experience to a higher level and motivate students even more. At the same time their preparedness for the job market would increase. It is recommended that the programme would search for such commissioned projects from the social partner network. The social partners the Panel met were enthusiastic about supporting the programme, and finding problems for students to solve as commissioned projects (at no cost to the social partner) should be explored with them.

The curriculum also includes the interdisciplinary subject of neuroscience. This module was highlighted by the students as one of the most unexpected during the programme; while at first perceived as irrelevant for the field, the students had clearly seen the value of the subject during the classes and it had created a transformation in their thinking about connecting different

areas of science. Such initiatives are highly encouraged also in the future and they reflect the emphasis the programme puts on employing scientific knowledge in the curriculum.

Finally, electives courses were removed from the programme during the upgrade. There is, however, a clear interest in a variety of topics, and as an example, sports scouting was mentioned as such an area by both students and alumni. Students have the chance to attend additional courses, but provided the student enrolment allows for this, a future development could be to allow for some elective course(s) or even pathways that can deepen the learning on either sport or tourism management, based on individual preferences, while keeping the overall scope of the programme in both industries.

In summary, the curriculum of the programme is well balanced and the themes of the courses build appropriately toward the programme aim. Students seem properly challenged by the courses and demonstrate evidence of transformation in their thinking during their programme. The content reflects the latest achievements in science and is appropriate for achievement of learning outcomes.

### ***2.3. Teaching staff***

In 2015 the programme had 15 lecturers with the student / lecturer ratio steady between 4 and 5 during the review period. These figures are appropriate. The age distribution of the lecturers ensures both experience and strong professional / practitioner careers as well the development of the next generation of sports lecturers and researchers. The sustainability of the programme from this perspective seems safe. The previous Report emphasized the need for courses to be delivered in English and the institution has taken important steps in this direction, also supporting faculty in language studies.

The faculty hiring process is according to the Lithuanian law and the number of faculty with doctorates exceeds requirements with 13 such faculty members. As a result of this the academic output of faculty is strong, including international conferences and publications, and the research areas are connected to the programme. The previous Report had recommended emphasis on this area and actions have included increased ERASMUS+ exchange and language training for faculty. Applications for project funding have also increased with recent success on an international projects related to sports club management. The ability to raise funds for a variety of projects and research is commendable.

Industry knowledge of the faculty is strong with multiple members having practitioner backgrounds, for example stakes in several sports associations and tourism businesses. This is perceived to bring significant value to the programme as latest industry trends are naturally filtered in the classroom.



Recently the number of foreign visiting lecturers has increased, for example from Karolinska Institute in Sweden and Manchester Metropolitan University in the UK. This is a positive development linked with the offering of the programme in English, and ties well with the long term goal of offering an international programme. The university has plans to develop a model for hiring full-time international faculty. While this is a commendable goal it may prove challenging in the international academic labour market. Another viable alternative could be to build more courses around visiting lecturers, although this would create challenges for programme and faculty management. Panel's recommendation is to look for benchmarks in other institutions on how to involve more foreign academics in the delivery of the programme without having to hire them on full-time basis.

The faculty is also engaged in other professional development, most notably in the form of internal seminars, though the focus seems to be on research related activities. This is understandable but the Panel highlights the need for pedagogical development of the faculty. There are many practitioners on the teaching team and the Panel would encourage helping them to move to an educational role by additional teaching support, further to the normal weekly seminars that are popular and appear well attended.

#### ***2.4. Facilities and learning resources***

The previous Report highlighted the need to upgrade library facilities as an urgent priority, and this recommendation has been actioned. The library is modern and offers an adequate number of computer workstations. The selection of material via online databases covers all the major sources of information, and agreements with EBSCO and Springerlink are being renegotiated with continued access to students. This is important as the pre-visit documentation only mentioned subscription until 2015, suggesting there could be an interruption to this. The weekend opening hours of the library should be extended to allow students use the facilities more efficiently. However, off-campus access to electronic resources compensates this partially.

Other facilities of the programme are adequate and match the nature of the programme. As a sports university it is essential that students have opportunities to practise their sport. Students can benefit for example from an indoor swimming pool and light athletics track among other facilities, and this increases the attractiveness of the programme. Classrooms are fit for purpose to deliver this programme and additional research facilities also exist. IT and other infrastructure are subject to constant updating needs, and the pre-visit documentation recognises this need. It is essential that continued investment in these areas is made.

The use of e-books has been explored by the library, but so far they have not been implemented in the programme. This valuable project should be moved forward as a priority, as

it reduces the need for printed materials and increases the environmental sustainability of the programme. This does not suggest inadequacy of the current learning materials but merely highlights an important avenue for improvement. Part of the courses use Moodle as a virtual learning environment, but so far this has not been standardised across courses.

Regarding SER material and the site visit, in the last 5 years there were solid investments in facility upgrades and laboratory equipment for scientific and practical activities. The inventory required for carrying out practical exercises is adequate and appropriate for the study programme.

Finally, the development of an Android-based mobile app to share information with students and faculty is highlighted as a positive aspect. This demonstrates that the university is following the latest trends and willing to invest in employing them.

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

The programme admission criteria are publicly available as required by regulations. While tourism or sports bachelor students are directly admitted on the programme, others are offered bridging courses to prepare them for their studies. Considering the specialised nature of the programme this is appropriate. A change in the admission was made starting 2015 when additional entry points for sports activities were removed. This reflects the goal of second cycle studies as scientific and it is appropriate for this level. The number of applicants on the programme has been on an upward trend during the period. While part of this reflects the closing of part-time studies, it also highlights the importance and quality of the programme.

The study process is able to produce an acceptable ratio of graduates vs. students admitted. The pre-visit documentation highlights reasons for fluctuations in this number, and in addition to common reasons for delayed graduation this programme, due to its nature, is also affected by sports activities. This is fully acceptable. Evidence of transformation in student thinking is clear and innovation is highlighted in the study process. As an example, the students discuss teachers encouraging them to come up with alternative presentation techniques to PowerPoint slides.

The final pieces of work on the master's programme appear to be of a very good standard. The system of topic choice is strong and the resulting pieces of work fall very clearly into the field of study. The scripts are well supported by appropriate literature. The students the Panel met demonstrated exceptional engagement with research, meeting the programme aims in a commendable way. Student publication of final research is widespread and the students regularly present their papers in conferences. The department publishes a journal to which students are encouraged to submit their work. Particularly notable is the increase in such output

during academic year 2014/15. The earlier mentioned effort in emphasizing research on the curriculum is clearly evident here, as is the research output provided by faculty. Social partners suggest topics for final theses, with the basketball association also contributing through stipends for student research.

Student mobility is somewhat challenging considering the shortened time of the programme and the fact that many students work while studying. Yet students manage to benefit from mobility and are encouraged to do this. While Erasmus is the main avenue of student exchange, industry relevant exchange also exists. As an example, three students were on internships at the National Basketball Association headquarters in London during study year 2014/ 15. Such initiatives, a notable achievement for LSU, can hopefully be increased in the future.

While the option for part-time studies was closed in 2014, the programme has strived to provide a study process that allows students to continue their part-time work. This is important both to attract students, but also to ensure their smooth transition into the labour market after graduation. To achieve this the university has implemented distance education options and flexibility on study hours. Distance education is delivered over Moodle with course content and lectures stored on the platform. Currently only a part of courses use Moodle; this is an excellent start and the Panel encourages widening this approach to all courses. Even more commendable is the flexibility over the teaching hours. Exemplifying the rapport between faculty and students, the teaching hours are agreed jointly at the beginning of a course and this allows students to continue their part-time work. This practise of joint agreement for the benefit of students is noteworthy.

The university has a career centre that assists student in preparing for entering the workforce, and scholarships are available on competitive and social bases. A student dormitory exists for optional accommodation. Tracking of students' employment after graduation has been improved and the alumni confirm regular contact from the university after they leave.

The programme level principles on assessment are publicly available and guide the assessment adequately. The statistics presented in the Report on averages and fails give a picture of balanced assessment on the aggregate level. The students know the ethical code of conduct the university has and seem to genuinely respect it. Nevertheless, appropriate methods for academic bad practise detection are in place. The students were very happy with the level of feedback they are given on their assessments and generally receive their marks within a week. Communication between the faculty and the students seems open and several alleys for this exist, including the earlier-mentioned mobile application in addition to face-to-face and usual electronic

communications. Alumni share this view of a university that made students feel comfortable during their studies.

To add with, the graduates the Panel met during the site visit were mostly working in the field of the studies, also the data collected about the graduates employability (in SER) confirms the majority is working according their profession.

## ***2.6. Programme management***

The administration of the programme is set up according to national laws and regulations and has appropriate support structures built with it. This set-up is mostly shared with the first cycle programme reviewed during the same visit. Quality at faculty level is monitored by the Faculty Committee of Study Quality Supervision. On the programme level Study Programme Committee coordinates the administration, decision making, quality and improvement of both the first and second cycle study programs jointly. This is reasonable as a fair few of the bachelor students continue with the master's programme. This committee has directors for first and second cycle programs respectively and representation from all the relevant stakeholders. The structure is consistent with the requirements and clear to all relevant parties including social partners, who seem very satisfied with this. It seems that at its current form the committee meets often, around monthly, but a fixed timetable does not exist. Panel's recommendation is to prepare an advance schedule of such meetings, possibly per term, to help faculty and students in proposing changes and improvements to the programme.

The students seem adequately involved in the development of the programme and an example of a change in a faculty member delivering an IT course initiated by students was described by both faculty and the students. The procedure was responsive and allowed for a fair chance of corrective action before a final decision of change was made.

Quality assurance is arranged according to university standards on five levels including courses, faculty, university, national accreditation and international faculty visits. Since 2012 an ISO quality management system has been under implementation but it has not been completed thus far. This is an important initiative and it should be given the resources needed in the future. Student learning experience has been assessed since 2012 according to a set university procedure, with student and subject related assessments done annually and faculty surveys done once every two years. Feedback is collected every semester. A further recommendation toward quality assurance from the Panel is an annual peer appraisal among faculty, based on attending classes of another faculty member and discussing observations and improvement ideas. Such a process can be a powerful tool for sharing knowledge among faculty, though the Panel notes that

it should not take the form of faculty performance assessment but remain as a collegial development initiative.

While assessment seems appropriately arranged in the university and faculty manages well even with the challenges of assessing group work, there seems to be a lack of a programme level group assessment policy. Currently this is not seen as a problem as students seem highly supportive and understanding of each other, demonstrating the good spirit of the programme. However, with the aspiration of enrolling international students this may change, and the Panel recommends design and implementation of a policy for group work assessment that allows for individualised grades in case of unequal output from group members.

There is a crossover between all stakeholders in the programme so for instance social partners and alumni may give visiting or other lectures in the institution, and some students and alumni are employed in the university. One deviation from the generally robust quality system was to meet a student representative, who worked on the programme, with the student group. A recommendation of this Panel is to consider how far the student representative on the study programme committee should have a financial or contractual link with the university. It depends on individual personalities as to how far this could be a problem and this is not to suggest in any way this was a problem with this particular student. However, on a systemic basis maybe students who work at the institution should have a special role on the study programme committee, but as separate and in addition to other student representatives.

In summary, the need for the programme is based on solid research and investigation of needs in the field of study. There is evidence of this based on student, alumni, teacher and social partner feedback. The programme is managed carefully, and feedback is collected and implemented continuously for future programme improvement.

## **2.7. Examples of excellence**

- The programme takes student research seriously. Students are regularly and increasingly presenting papers in conferences and submitting to journals, with joint conferences and a department journal as avenues for this, in addition to national and international events. There has been a significant improvement in this area since the previous accreditation visit. Social partners are included in student research both in terms of topics but also by providing research scholarship. Students are able to discuss research and clearly fulfil the programme emphasis on scientific knowledge

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Panel recommends that the programme would approach social partners to find real-life projects that the students can practise on during their courses. This would significantly improve the learning experience of the students and create further engagement between the social partners and the programme. The style of such projects has to be carefully thought through though, as often such projects are better when of “nice-to-know” rather than of “business critical” nature.
2. The Panel recommends increasing pedagogical development of faculty, and providing more support in developing these competences, in addition to the weekly seminars that are being held.
3. The university has discussed moving to e-books, and the Panel emphasizes the benefits of such a change. Panel’s recommendation is to get this transition under way as soon as possible, together with extending the use of virtual learning platforms to all courses.
4. While at the moment the programme does not seem to experience issues related to group work assessment, the Panel sees this as a potential future issue, particularly if international students are admitted on the programme. Therefore, Panel recommends the development of a programme (or department) –wide group work assessment policy that details how group marks are individualized and how situations of imbalanced student contribution toward a project can be resolved.
5. The Panel noted a crossover between the different stakeholders of the programme. For stronger quality assurance, Panel recommends that students simultaneously employed by the school do not possess a double role as a student representative on the Study Committee. As the presence of such active and engaged students in the committee could still be beneficial to all counterparts, a special role could possibly be developed.

#### **IV. SUMMARY**

The second cycle study programme Tourism and Sports Management offers a good evidence-based education and meets a need for the Lithuanian Sports industry as a whole. The Panel found the management team to be well versed in the programme with clear appreciation of its identity and potential future direction. The programme appears to be appreciated by students and social partners alike. The research profile of the institution in the sports management area draws upon the links the programme has and that research profile is very reasonable. The programme has fair mobility with other European institutions with both students and teachers having international experience. Alumni speak well of the programme and the links and relationships with well –connected, dynamic and enthusiastic social partners are impressive. Social partners see the programme as a resource for ideas, networking and employees.

For continued improvement it is important to ensure that faculty, with significant research and practitioner backgrounds, has appropriate opportunities for pedagogical development. Project work in groups is seen as very important for the development of the students and transforming such projects into real-life ones with social partners, and developing related assessment policies, is important for the future. The recommendations provided in this Report will hopefully contribute to developing the programme further in its important role within the Lithuanian sports and tourism industry.

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme TOURISM AND SPORTS MANAGEMENT (state code – 621N90001) at LITHUANIAN SPORTS 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	4
6.	Programme management	3
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>19</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:	Dr. Mary Lyn Glanz
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Eneken Titov
	Henri Kuokkanen
	Linas Pučinskas
	Indrė Šareikaitė



**LIETUVOS SPORTO UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ  
PROGRAMOS *TURIZMO IR SPORTO VADYBA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621N90001)  
2016-08-19 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-196 IŠRAŠAS**

&lt;...&gt;

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

LIETUVOS SPORTO UNIVERSITETO studijų programa *TURIZMO IR SPORTO VADYBA* (valstybinis kodas – 621N90001) vertinama **teigiamai**.

<b>Eil. Nr.</b>	<b>Vertinimo sritis</b>	<b>Srities įvertinimas, balais*</b>
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	4
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	<b>Iš viso:</b>	<b>19</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)

&lt;...&gt;

**2.7. Gerosios praktikos pavyzdžiai**

Įgyvendinant studijų programą Turizmo ir sporto vadyba rimtai žiūrima į studentų mokslinius tyrimus. Studentai konferencijose nuolat ir vis dažniau pristato mokslinius pranešimus ir teikia mokslinius straipsnius žurnalams; be nacionalinių ir tarptautinių renginių, jie dalyvauja jungtinėse konferencijose bei skelbia savo darbus katedros leidžiamame žurnale. Po ankstesnio akreditacijos vizito šioje srityje pastebimas žymus pagerėjimas. Socialiniai partneriai prisideda prie studentų mokslinių tyrimų – jie ne tik siūlo temas, bet ir suteikia tyrimų stipendiją. Studentai geba diskutuoti apie mokslinius tyrimus ir neabejotinai įgyvendina programos orientaciją į mokslines žinias.

&lt;...&gt;

#### **IV. SANTRAUKA**

Antrosios pakopos (magistrantūros) studijų programa *Turizmo ir sporto vadyba* suteikia gerą, įrodymais pagrįstą išsilavinimą ir tenkina viso Lietuvos sporto sektoriaus poreikius. Vertinimo grupė pastebėjo, kad programos vadovai gerai išmano šią programą, aiškiai supranta jos tapatumą ir galimą būsimą kryptį. Šią programą palankiai vertina studentai ir socialiniai partneriai. Universiteto mokslinių tyrimų sporto vadybos srityje profilį, kuris yra labai tinkamas, lemia programos turimi ryšiai. Šios programos studentai ir dėstytojai, nemažai dalyvaudami judumo programose kitose Europos institucijose, įgyja tarptautinės patirties. Absolventai gerai atsiliepia apie šią programą; jų ryšiai ir santykiai su gerų ryšių turinčiais, dinamiškais ir entuziastingais socialiniais partneriais daro įspūdį. Socialinių partnerių akimis ši studijų programa yra idėjų, tinklaveikos ir darbuotojų išteklių (šaltinis).

Nuolatinio programos tobulinimo tikslais svarbu užtikrinti, kad dėstytojai, turintys įspūdingos patirties moksliniuose tyrimuose ir praktikoje, turėtų tinkamas pedagoginio tobulėjimo galimybes. Grupinis projektinis darbas laikomas labai svarbiu studentų tobulėjimo veiksmu; ateityje svarbu kartu su socialiniais partneriais paversti šiuos projektus realiai įgyvendinamais projektais ir išvystyti susijusią vertinimo politiką. Tikimasi, kad šiose išvadose pateiktos rekomendacijos padės toliau tobulinti programą, atliekančią svarbų vaidmenį Lietuvos sporto ir turizmo sektoriuje.

<...>

#### **III. REKOMENDACIJOS**

1. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja prašyti socialinių partnerių siūlyti realiai įgyvendinamus projektus, kad studentai galėtų studijuodami praktikuotis. Tai labai praturtintų studentų mokymosi patirtį ir sukurtų papildomą socialinių partnerių ryšį su šia programa. Tačiau reikėtų rūpestingai apmąstyti minėtų projektų modelį, nes tokie projektai geresni, kai jie yra ne „puiku žinoti“ (*nice-to-know*), o ne „būtinai, kad verslas būtų sėkmingas“ (*business critical*) pobūdžio.
2. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja gerinti dėstytojų pedagoginę kvalifikaciją ir suteikti daugiau pagalbos šiems gebėjimams tobulinti, be to, kad kiekvieną savaitę rengiami seminarai.
3. Universitetas apsvarstė perėjimą prie e. knygų, ir vertinimo grupė akcentuoja šių pokyčių naudą. Grupė rekomenduoja kuo greičiau įgyvendinti šį perėjimą, kartu išplečiant virtualios mokymo (si) aplinkos taikymą visiems dalykams.

4. Nors šiuo metu, atrodo, nekyla klausimų dėl grupinio darbo vertinimo, vertinimo grupės nuomone, šis klausimas gali būti aktualus ateityje, ypač jei į šią programą bus priimami tarptautiniai studentai. Todėl vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja tobulinti programą (arba katedrą) – įgyvendinti plataus grupinio darbo vertinimo politiką, kuri padėtų detalizuoti, kaip grupės pažymiai individualizuojami ir kaip spręsti problemą, kai atskirų asmenų indėlis į projektą yra nevienodas.
5. Vertinimo grupė atkreipė dėmesį į perėjimą tarp skirtingų šios programos socialinių dalininkų. Kad būtų geriau užtikrinta kokybė, vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja, kad mokykloje įdarbinti studentai neturėtų dvigubų funkcijų, t. y. nebūtų ir atstovais studijų komitete. Kadangi šių aktyvių ir angažuotų studentų buvimas komitete vis dėlto galėtų būti naudingas visiems jų kolegoms, galbūt reikėtų sukurti jiems specialias funkcijas.

<...>

---

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)