



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

MARIJAMPOLĖS KOLEGIJOS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS "ŽEMĖS ŪKIO TECHNOLOGIJA"
(valstybinis kodas - 6531IX006)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF "AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY" (state code - 6531IX006)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at MARIJAMPOLE COLLEGE

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

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Žemės ūkio technologija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	6531IX006
Studijų sritis	Biomedicinos mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Žemės ūkio technologijos
Studijų programos rūšis	Koleginės
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (3 m); Iššęstinė (4 m)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	180
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Žemės ūkio mokslų bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2001-08-31

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Agricultural Technology</i>
State code	6531IX006
Study area	Biomedical Sciences
Study field	Agricultural Technology
Type of the study programme	College studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (3 years); Part time (4 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	180
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Professional Bachelor of Agricultural Technology
Date of registration of the study programme	31 st August, 2001

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process.....	4
1.2. General.....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information.....	4
1.4. The Review Team.....	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2.2. Curriculum design	7
2.3. Teaching staff	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	10
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	12
2.6. Programme management	14
2.7. Examples of excellence *	16
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
IV. SUMMARY	19
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	21

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

Marijampole College offers a range of bachelor degree programmes in business, social work, education and technology. The degree in Agricultural Technologies is a professional bachelor programme. It has been delivered in its current format since 2001, although the College had been providing agricultural education for several years prior to this. The programme was last

evaluated in 2014. The review team met senior management and teaching staff, social partners and alumni. Although the programme is offered on both a full- and part-time basis the team met only part-time students, the majority of whom were in their fourth year.

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 24/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

The programme fits with the College's mission to provide education that meets local and national needs. It is managed by the Department of Technologies, which is one of two departments in the Faculty of Business and Technology. The College does not offer any other bachelor degree programmes in agriculture or related subjects.

The programme in Agricultural Technology was developed in 2001 to meet the needs of Lithuanian agriculture for highly trained specialists with advanced knowledge. The programme focuses on the study of technological processes of crop production, animal husbandry and agricultural commerce. Programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the needs of the state, societal and labour market. It has 180 credits and the correct number of hours associated with the credits. The title of the programme is suitable, reflecting its content, learning outcomes and the qualification.

The aims of the programme and its learning outcomes are stated on the College's public website. The aim of the programme is to train graduates that are able to *'manage the production, storage and realisation of agricultural activities, to organise work of a business enterprise/sub-division,*

to apply intensive technologies of agricultural productions and environmental as well as labour safety requirements, to communicate and cooperate with employees and business partners'.

The learning outcomes reflect the aims of the programme and place emphasis on management and organisation. They specify that graduates will be able to 'organise', 'select', 'assess' and 'plan'. For example, graduates are expected to be able to 'Organise the technological process of plant growing', 'To project and manage technological processes' and to 'Plan the activities and income of the company'. However, there is no direct reference to the evaluation, selection and use of agricultural technologies to improve the efficiency and profitability of agricultural operations as would normally be expected in a programme with this title.

In addition, the learning outcomes do not differentiate the knowledge and its application, research skills, special abilities, social abilities and personal abilities that graduates are expected to be able to demonstrate. Instead, they comprise a list of the outcomes associated with the main study subjects and separate lists of the outcomes associated with each of the three optional specialisations that students can select from. They also make little reference to the use of the newest scientific evidence, gathering and analysing data for solving specific issues and studying in an autonomous manner.

At programme design level, the programme aims and learning outcomes and their links with study subjects were not well documented in the self-evaluation report. The teaching staff the review team met did not appear to be familiar with the principles of learning outcomes and students did not understand the concept of learning outcomes when the review team asked them. In addition, the students the team met had little understanding of the requirement for development of their knowledge, skills and competencies as they progressed through the programme. This is discussed further in the programme management section of this report.

The links between programme learning outcomes and study subjects are defined in the self-evaluation report. The review team noticed some discord between learning outcomes and study subjects. For example, two of the learning outcomes relating to the selling of agricultural produce are *to organize preparation of the marketing of agricultural produce* and *to organize selling of the agricultural produce*. However in the list of study subjects there is reference to *Business language and office-work* but no specific reference to the module *Agricultural marketing*. Under the outcome *to organize the storage of agricultural produce* there is no reference to the module *Agricultural business logistics*. Similarly it is difficult to link the study subject *Pig breeding* to the learning outcome *to organize technological process of cattle breeding*. The review panel received clarification on this matter from the college. A translation

error in the documentatons led to the use of the term “Cattle breeding”. The translation should have been ‘animal husbandry’. This clarification was very helpful.

The review team recommends that the College revise the learning outcomes of the programme and associated documentation, so that they reflect the title of the programme, so that they are better linked to the study subjects and modules, so that they clearly identify the knowledge and skills graduates acquire and so that they more explicitly meet the requirements specified for level 6 of the Lithuanian Qualifications Framework or the European Qualifications Framework.

2.2. Curriculum design

The structure of the programme meets the minimum legislative requirements of the Republic of Lithuania. The programme is offered on a full time or part-time basis. The full-time programme is delivered over 6 semesters, the part-time programme over 8 semesters. Within the curriculum subjects are delivered in a planned and systematic way. There is no evidence of duplication of subjects. First-year modules provide students with the appropriate background in plant and animal science, mechanisation, business organisation and environmental protection. In their second year students apply this knowledge in the study of crop and livestock production and relevant aspects of law, agricultural economics and policy. In their third year students complete a specialist subject and the final thesis. Professional practice starts in semester 2 and is integrated throughout the programme. Students do not complete any analytical laboratory work but do examine samples of materials such as crops and weeds, soil profiles and fertilizer materials. The structure of the programme and the teaching and learning methods used are described on the College website.

The module descriptions did not closely match the learning outcomes and there was a high level of generalised description. The documents need to be more specific. For example, the review team found the module description in the self-evaluation report as *to organize the agricultural process* (it is not clear what kind of process and to which kind of agricultural sector is it related), and the learning outcomes *to organize technological process of plant growing, to organize technological process of cattle breeding, to select agricultural machinery, to exploit agricultural buildings*. These statements do not have the required level of specificity. Information about knowledge and skills that a graduate should have after passing the study subjects was not easy to find. The same applies to the information about how the knowledge/skills support the achievement of module goals.

The learning outcomes of the individual modules do not differentiate the knowledge and skills students will acquire. They also provide little evidence of academic progression as students pass from the first to the final year. The learning outcomes of the first year modules frequently refer to students being able to ‘describe’, ‘know’, ‘explain’, ‘analyse’ and ‘list’. However, the same verbs are also frequently used to define the learning outcomes of the second and third year modules. Relatively few final year modules refer to the expectation that students will be able to ‘master’, ‘critically evaluate’, ‘discuss’ or ‘explain in detail’.

In their third year students select one from the three specialisations that the College currently offers: Stockbreeding production technology; Ecological agriculture; Agricultural Commerce. The Ecological agriculture specialisation is under review as few students have opted for it. There is currently no specialisation available in crop production, although this is an important farming practice in the region. The review team was informed that the College is currently reviewing the programme. This process needs to involve the social partners in a systematic manner so that it fully reflects national and local needs.

The curriculum documentation makes little reference to some key topics, for example European Union legislation and recent developments in the Common Agricultural Policy. The social partners also highlighted the need for the programme to address current practice and issues at national and European Union level. In the meetings with staff and students it was evident that these topics are covered in lectures, however this needs to be reflected in the module descriptions too.

The structure of the programme should be reviewed so that the specializations match more closely regional needs, for example in the area of agronomy. The sequencing of modules must be aligned with student placement and the social partners must be consulted in a more systematic manner during the process of curriculum development.

The programme documentation describes appropriate and diverse active and passive teaching methods, including lectures, laboratory, practical and individual work, discussion, group work, brainstorming, situation analysis etc. Students did not mention any examples of this variety in their discussion with the review team. During this meeting students also expressed a desire for more practical work.

2.3. Teaching staff

The number and qualifications of teaching staff meet the legal requirements of the Republic of Lithuania. The 21 staff members, (including 2 docents, 17 lecturers and 2 assistants, one with a

doctoral degree and the remainder with Master's degree) are adequate to ensure the programmes learning outcomes are addressed. The senior management team reported that the majority of teaching staff are employed on a part-time basis. Many of them have their own companies, or are working in schools or other institutions. This matched the information provided by the teaching staff themselves. Of the ten staff the review team met eight confirmed that they were part-time teachers. However, this conflicts with the information in the self-evaluation report, which states that 85% of teachers are full-time.

The review team recognises the advantages of having teaching staff that are involved in local business and the economy. They bring an understanding of regional needs to their teaching and an emphasis on practical requirements. This was well described to the review team by the teacher of accountancy who is also a bookkeeper in a local business. However, overall the fact that most of the staff is part-time has a negative impact on the collective understanding of the totality of the programme and its objectives. In the group of ten teaching staff met by the panel, only one had been involved in the preparation of the self-evaluation report.

Very few of the teaching staff was involved in applied research. This is a weakness and its impact on the students was evident in the team's meetings with them. They had no real understanding of applied research and its potential for increasing agricultural output. This lack of familiarity with research was also clearly reflected in the quality of the theses reviewed by the team, as noted above.

In its discussions with the review team the management staff of the College recognised the importance of applied research. In the meeting with the teachers the staff said that they get institutional support if they wish to attend conferences. However, more complex measures are needed to ensure that more staff engage in applied research. This will require more systematic engagement with a variety of local, regional and national partners. The academic rigour of the programme is undermined by lack of management focus on developing an appropriate applied research focus amongst the teaching staff.

When asked to describe their teaching styles and practices, the teaching staff made no reference to the development of higher-level knowledge, skills and competencies as students progressed through the programme. For example, the team were informed that some students had been involved with data collection for a staff research project, but had not been involved in the

analysis, synthesis or evaluation of the data. This overreliance on description rather than analysis and evaluation was also evident in the theses examined.

In the previous evaluation report, reference was made to the need to improve the pedagogical and linguistic skills of the staff. This review team saw limited evidence of progress on this recommendation. According to the self-evaluation report the College teaching staff were engaged with the ERASMUS mobility programme (14 times in total), different international trainings, seminars and conferences. However, only a few teachers were able to communicate in English without the assistance of an interpreter during the meeting with the review team. Moodle is still used to a very limited extent, and should be expanded.

The individual teaching staff members were unable to outline to the review team what they considered to be the key subjects of the programme. Therefore there is a need for regular meetings of all teaching staff so that they all understand the totality of the programme structure and its aims and objectives. The Study Programme Committee needs to operate more effectively. It must provide a level of oversight and act as a conduit for information between students, staff, social partners and management..

Regarding the turnover of staff as understood from the SER and basing the site visit there were no dramatic changes despite few teachers: one has left, another has joined to teaching in recent years.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

Compared to the previous evaluation and its recommendations, the college has made some essential changes in learning resources and equipment. Some equipment, class rooms, library and computer rooms needed for the study programme have been improved and are adequate in their size and quality for the study programme. However some laboratories remain un-renovated and have out-dated equipment.

The previous evaluation also commented on the old software in computer classes. This has improved noticeably, with the operating system being changed from Microsoft XP to Windows 7 or Windows 10. During the site visit the social partners showed new software available for students during agricultural technology practice. Specialized agriculture software widely used in Lithuania (eGEBA, AgroGis, Smart farmer, AgroSmart etc.) is used to teach students. The review team was told that further renovation work is planned.

The College's lecture rooms are adequate for the delivery of the programme. The library has a collection of textbooks, some of which are quite dated. It also subscribes to some topical agriculture magazines. The part-time students that the review team met reported that the library resources, including books and workstations, were adequate for their needs. However, the team was not able to obtain the views of full-time students, as none were met during the visit. The review team was also uncertain as to whether library resources were genuinely adequate or whether the students' comments were a reflection of low expectations of the teaching, learning and assessment of the programme. There is a need to benchmark the library resources against examples of good national and international practice.

Teaching materials in the library are easy accessible. WI-FI connection is free to use in all the college for students and teachers. During the site visit evaluation the team observed that students use books recommended by teaching staff and rarely or ever search for newer or different publications in their research field. Trainings to find useful and relevant information on the Internet and library databases might be useful for students.

The previous review report made strong recommendations about the need to improve the practical facilities available to students. The College has a 65ha field that it rents. However, in practice, the relatively low recruitment to the programme and the high cost of modern machinery limit the extent to which this resource can be developed. Therefore the College has developed arrangements with companies and farmers to enable them to observe modern agricultural practices in operation. The review team noted evidence of improvement in the planned use of the facilities of some of the social partners. It visited a dairy farm where students are able to observe and discuss modern milking and dairy equipment, livestock and farm management software. At another site it learned about opportunities students have to learn about the operation of machinery including agricultural sprayers and seed drills.

Students complete their professional practice on farms. A tripartite agreement has to be signed by the student, the placement provider and the College. This ensures that all parties are aware of the expectations of the practice period. Students report that the activities to be completed are clearly defined. The team was informed that in some cases the practice takes place on a farm owned by a family member, typically a parent. One consequence of this is that in such cases the family member makes the assessment of a student's practical competencies. This raises serious questions about its impartiality of such an assessment. It could lead to a student being unfairly disadvantaged or advantaged compared to others not assessed in this way.

There is a real need for some practical laboratory facilities at the college itself, so that students are able to collect, analyse and report on their own data. For example, what the team was shown as a “seed/soil laboratory” was not equipped to undertake soil analysis.

The previous report stressed the importance of establishing a strong alumni network and the need for more regular engagement with social partners and alumni. The meetings that the team held at the College provided no evidence that this recommendation had been heeded. The alumni and social partners told the team that they had had no familiarity with the self-evaluation report. They also had been given little information about the purpose of their presence to meet the panel.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The review team found the entrance requirements easily accessible, consistent and transparent as published on the College website. The programme corresponds to the needs of Lithuania, especially its southwest region. Most of the graduates the panel met were involved with agricultural activities in the region. It is also evident that the learning environment and implementation correspond to the minimum requirements of the programme, and support the achievement of a minimum threshold of learning outcomes.

At the time of this review there were no full or part-time students in year one of the programme. This is a major concern and is discussed further below in relation to recruitment and programme management. The review team did not meet any full-time students and because of this was unable to obtain their views on the programme. The part-time students the review team met were from year's two to four. They explained that they had chosen to study in the College due to its proximity to their home.

This cohort of part-time students told the review team that they had no involvement in the preparation of the self-evaluation report. They had no communication with the Study Programme Committee or the self-evaluation report preparation committee. Their pattern of attendance in the college does not encourage communication and the team heard nothing from the students about any communication during the part of the semester when they have no scheduled lectures or college based practical work. The students the review team met were unaware of the College's procedures for complaints and appeals. The self-evaluation report also contained no data on appeals or complaints. The self-evaluation report indicates that the College had received no complaints relating to the programme in the last 5 years. Students found the questionnaires used by the College to be far too long and they had no sense of any feedback loop from the

questionnaires. They were not familiar with the national framework of qualifications and its concomitant requirement for progression outlets. At a later stage in their career the deficit in progression arrangements may inhibit the progress of these students.

The students the team met had limited understanding of how the level of their knowledge, skills and competences were expected to change as they advanced through the course. In examining the undergraduate theses, the review team saw some works that were quite descriptive. This mirrors their insufficient involvement in scientific activities.

According to the self-evaluation report a clear system of assessing student achievements has been worked out in the College, but in the course of looking at final theses and talking with students about practical assessment the review team identified some deficits in the system. For practical assessment, many students returned to their home farms and a family member, usually a parent carried out one element of the assessment. This practice does not conform to any standard of impartiality. The standard of marking in theses was, in some cases, at odds with the content. In one example, the English language summary in a document bore no relationship to the rest of the document. There was evidence in some of these that students were not making use of the outcomes of recent scientific research or technical innovations and that marking could have been more rigorous. For example, one of the theses that had been awarded a mark of 9 out of 10 had only four references, three of which were dated 2001 or earlier. Another that had also been awarded a mark of 9 cited no references more recent than 2002. Therefore the team recommends that thesis guidelines be revised, so that they fully reflect the expectations of a professional bachelor degree award. Staff and students must have a clear understanding of these requirements. Very specific guidelines on the marking of theses should be developed and used by all involved. Additional training for staff should be provided in relation to this recommendation.

The programme is delivered in a relatively planned and systematic way that enables students to achieve learning outcomes. Methods of assessment and grading systems are fully described in the module descriptions. Marking is completed using the 1 to 10 scale, in line with national requirements. The grading criteria for each module are specified in its description. Some element of moderation and oversight of grading needs to be introduced in order to create consistency.

Students confirmed that they have opportunities to participate in the ERASMUS programme. Details are provided to them and the procedures are also described on the College website. In reality, the students had some very limited opportunities for overseas work but no real opportunities for overseas study. Students need opportunities to study and work at home and

abroad in partner institutions. The college does point out that whilst the number of students on the programme is decreasing, that the number of students going abroad increased from 1 in 2013-2014 to 4 in 2016-2017. These 4 students were abroad at the time of the site visit by the review team. The students are aware of the possibility of the exchange, but it should be more encouraged and then shared between the students. Students would benefit from opportunities to study and work in partner institutions in Lithuania and abroad in order to expand their knowledge and experience. There were evident issues with their linguistic competence to follow programmes in languages other than Lithuanian. As this may deter student participation, more attention must be paid to the linguistic skills of both staff and students.

The students the team met reported that teaching staff are friendly and supportive. The college seems to give proper academic and social support for students if needed. This is well-documented in the self-evaluation report and easily found and transparent on the website of the College.

The part-time students the team met reported that they normally attended the college for 20 days in total each semester and that the number of contact hours in each of these days varied. All other work was completed outside these twenty days. The team was not able to discern any systematic pattern of on-going engagement with these students. The college must review the adequacy of this mode of engagement in terms of achieving the learning outcomes of the programme.

2.6. Programme management

The self-evaluation report notes that the College's quality management system has been certified as meeting the requirements of ISO 9001:2016. However, the review team found little evidence that it was operating effectively as far as this programme is concerned.

The programme was last reviewed in 2014. The college management stressed that the previous report was received on 24/02/2015 and that the college had, therefore, less than two years to implement all the previous recommendations.. Management also called attention to the impact of changes in The Study Programme Committee. Over the previous two years, the chair of the committee had changed twice. This was done to attempt to improve the management of the programme. The previous report concludes with the statement that '*whilst recognising that this programme has some strengths, significant improvements will have to be made if this course is to meet the challenging demands of agricultural education into the future*'. It goes on to make a

series of recommendations, identifying improvements required to the content, operation, facilities and management of the programme.

The review team found little evidence of any systematic attempt to address these recommendations, either by the management committees within the College or in the self-evaluation report compiled for this review. Given the extent and nature of the recommendations it points towards the need for a much more responsive approach to the management of the programme.

There were no students recruited in 2016 but the self-evaluation report indicates that the competitive scores of entrants have declined continuously over the last few years. This is a concern for the programme so the College must examine the internal and external factors responsible for this, and develop and implement a strategy to improve recruitment. The matter needs to be addressed promptly and involve students and alumni as well as teaching staff and senior management.

As noted above the teaching staff and students the review team met could not clearly explain 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. Hence the College should take planned steps to increase the understanding of them by staff and students.

The self-evaluation report notes that the programme is managed by the Department of Technology and overseen by the Study Programme Committee, which reports to the Academic Council. It was reported that at the time of this review (May 2017) the Study Programme Committee had met three times since the start of the academic year. However, the review team found little evidence that it had addressed the recommendations of the previous review or the major recruitment difficulties the programme is facing. The teaching staff the team met were also unaware of its activities. Hence there is a need to improve the effectiveness of programme management systems. Management does not have an on-going organised relationship with social partners and alumni. This deficit was highlighted in the previous report and has not been addressed. This was a particular concern in view of the issues highlighted to us about the need to improve agriculture in this region.

Senior management staff noted that a review of the structure, operation and objectives of the Study Programme Committees is underway, which will result in them having more authority.

There is scope to improve the effectiveness and involvement of students in the quality assurance of their own programme. The self-evaluation report notes that the College conducts annual surveys of students to obtain their views on teaching quality and study subjects. Some of the students the review team met were unsure about whether they had completed surveys or not. Others reported that the questionnaires used by the college are far too long and they had no sense of any feedback from the College to issues they had raised.

The review team recognises the value of professional bachelor programmes aligned with identified regional and national needs. There is clearly a need for this programme but it is important that the strategic, management and operational issues identified in this report are addressed.

2.7. Examples of excellence *

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The College must assign high priority to developing and implementing a strategy to improve recruitment to the programme. This must include an evaluation of internal and external factors and involve students and social partners as well as senior management and teaching staff.
2. The College should review and revise the learning outcomes of the programme and its modules, so that they reflect the title of the programme, so that they clearly identify the knowledge and skills graduates acquire and so that they more explicitly meet the requirements specified in the Lithuanian Qualifications Framework and the European Qualifications Framework. As part of this process the College is advised to benchmark the curriculum and standards of the programme against comparable national and international programmes.
3. The College should take planned steps to ensure that teaching staff and students are aware of 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.
4. The college needs to develop a broad programme of pedagogical up skilling for staff, including but not limited to linguistic skills.
5. The College should review and if necessary revise the specialisations available to students, so that they more appropriately develop industry requirements and recent technological developments.
6. The curriculum documentation should be reviewed and updated on an annual basis, so that it reflects modern commercial practices and recent scientific, technological and regulatory developments.
7. The thesis guidelines should be revised, so that they fully reflect the outcomes required for a professional bachelor degree award.
8. The College needs to develop a targeted approach to applied research. Staff and students need opportunities to engage in applied research.

9. The College must ensure that students are made aware of the procedures for making a complaint or appealing against an academic decision.
10. There is a need for more regular staff meetings, so that the totality of the programme structure, its aims and objectives are understood by all.
11. The College should take steps to ensure that students are more fully involved in the quality assurance of the programme.
12. The College should ensure that the Study Programme Committee becomes more proactive and works effectively to ensure that its normal responsibilities and these recommendations are addressed and that the programme responds to the needs of the students and farming communities it serves.

IV. SUMMARY

The programme aims and learning outcomes need refinement Programme documentation must be strengthened. Staff and students must have a clear understanding of the appropriate learning outcomes for this level of award

The structure of the curriculum needs to reflect the requirement for progression in knowledge, skills and competencies at each stage of the programme.

The Study Programme Committee must be an active moderator of programme standards, build links with social partners and alumni and co-ordinate the quality assurance of the programme.

The review team found very little evidence of any systematic attempt to address the recommendations of the last evaluation, either by the management committees within the College or in the self-evaluation report compiled for this review. Given the extent and serious nature of the recommendations this is a serious failing. It points towards the need for a much more responsive approach to the management of the programme.

The teaching staff must be assisted to become more familiar with the totality of the programme structure, aims, objectives and learning outcomes. A major programme of pedagogical development must be made available to all part-time and full-time teaching staff. This programme needs to develop competencies in teaching higher order knowledge, skills and competences. As noted in the previous report, additional work is needed on the linguistic skills of staff. The College management must support the development of an appropriate programme of applied research in which most teaching staff are engaged. Students must be given opportunities to engage in realistic applied research appropriate to the professional orientation of the programme. Local, regional and national partners are required to develop this applied research programme.

A more considered approach to the preparation of a self-evaluation report is needed. On this occasion, inconsistencies and omissions were evident. There was little evidence of a capacity for strategic thinking, self-reflection or robust analysis.

The review team notes the improvement in the use of facilities owned and managed by social partners. Additional work on facilities at the college is required.

The previous report recommended that strong relationships be built with alumni and social partners. There was no evidence of any real attention being paid to this recommendation.

The panel met no full-time students. This was a serious omission. The part-time students described a pattern of attendance that is not conducive to optimal learning. They had no familiarity with the quality assurance processes or the management structures of the college. They had no exposure to comparable programmes and appeared to have a limited expectation of

the standards expected from them or that they were entitled to receive. They described the teaching staff as friendly and helpful.

The review team found very little evidence of any systematic attempt to address the recommendations of the previous report, either by the management committees within the College or in the self-evaluation report compiled for this review. Given the extent and serious nature of the recommendations this is a serious failing. It points towards the need for a much more responsive approach to the management of the programme.

College management needs to attend in a serious, timely and consistent manner to the serious challenges facing this programme in respect of recruitment, marketing, resourcing, development, and quality assurance.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Agricultural technology* (state code – 6531IX006) at Marijampole College 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	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	2
	Total:	13

*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

**MARIJAMPOLĖS KOLEGIJOS PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
ŽEMĖS ŪKIO TECHNOLOGIJA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 6531IX006)
2017-08-22 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-184 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Marijampolės kolegijos studijų programa *Žemės ūkio technologija* (valstybinis kodas – 6531IX006) vertinama teigiamai.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	13

* 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

Reikia patobulinti studijų programos tikslus ir studijų rezultatus bei studijų programos dokumentaciją. Dėstytojai ir studentai privalo aiškiai suprasti įgyjamo laipsnio studijų rezultatus. Studijų turinio struktūra turi atspindėti reikalavimus, kurie rodytų žinių, įgūdžių ir kompetencijų pažangą kiekviename studijų programos etape.

Studijų programos komitetas turi aktyviai stebėti šios studijų programos standartus, užmegzti ryšius su socialiniais partneriais ir alumnais bei kontroliuoti studijų programos kokybės užtikrinimą.

Ekspertų grupė pastebėjo, kad nėra sistemingo siekio įgyvendinti ankstesniojo vertinimo rekomendacijas. Tai galioja kolegijos valdymo komitetams ir savianalizės suvestinę šiam vertinimui rengusiai grupei. Atsižvelgiant į šių rekomendacijų apimtį ir jų svarbą, tai rimta problema. Reikia daugiau dėmesio skirti studijų programos vadybai.

Padėti dėstytojams išsamiau susipažinti su studijų programos visuma, jos tikslais, uždaviniais ir studijų rezultatais. Visu ir ne visu etatu dirbantiems dėstytojams reikia parengti visapusišką programą pedagoginei kvalifikacijai kelti. Ši programa turi padėti jiems įgyti kompetencijų, kurios užtikrintų aukštesnės kokybės žinias ir įgūdžius. Kaip buvo nurodyta ankstesnėse išvadose, reikia papildomai dirbti siekiant pagerinti dėstytojų užsienio kalbų įgūdžius. Kolegijos vadovybė privalo padėti parengti atitinkamą taikomųjų tyrimų programą, kurioje dalyvautų daugelis dėstytojų. Studentams reikia sudaryti galimybes dalyvauti realiuose taikomuosiuose tyrimuose, kurie atitiktų jų profesinę studijų programos kryptį. Šiai taikomųjų tyrimų programai parengti reikia vietos, regiono ir šalies partnerių pagalbos.

Atsakingiau rengti savianalizės suvestinę. Reikia paminėti, kad neatitikimai ir praleidimai buvo akivaizdūs. Trūksta strateginio mąstymo, savirefleksijos ar tvirtos analizės gebėjimų.

Ekspertų grupė pastebėjo, kad pagerėjo naudojimas materialiąja baze, kuri priklauso ir kurią valdo socialiniai partneriai. Būtina gerinti kolegijos materialiąją bazę.

Ankstesnėse išvadose buvo rekomenduojama užmegzti tvirtesnius ryšius su alumnais ir socialiniais partneriais. Nematyti, kad realiai būtų imtasi veiksmų šiai rekomendacijai įgyvendinti.

Ekspertai nebuvo susitikę su nuolatinėmis studijų studentais. Tai rimtas trūkumas. Išėstinių studijų studentai nurodė lankomumo pavyzdį, kuris neužtikrina optimalaus mokymosi. Jie nebuvo susipažinę su kolegijos kokybės užtikrinimo tvarka arba valdymo struktūra, taip pat nežino apie panašias studijų programas, su kuriomis galėtų palyginti savo studijų programą, menkai žino, ko iš jų tikimasi ar ką jie privalo įgyti. Jie nurodė, kad dėstytojai yra draugiški ir paslaugūs.

Ekspertų grupė nepastebėjo, kad kolegijos pagrindiniai komitetai sistemingai siektų įgyvendinti ankstesniojo vertinimo išvadų rekomendacijas, tai neatspindi ir savianalizės suvestinėje, kuri buvo rengiama šiam vertinimui. Atsižvelgus į rekomendacijų apimtį ir svarbą, tai didelis trūkumas. Todėl būtina užtikrinti atsakingesnę požiūrį į šios studijų programos vadybą.

Kolegijos vadovybė turi rimtai, laiku ir atsakingai įvertinti nemenkus iššūkius, su kuriais susiduria ši studijų programa, ir apsvarstyti studentų priėmimo, rinkodaros, žmogiškųjų išteklių, plėtros ir kokybės užtikrinimo klausimus.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Kolegija pirmumo tvarka turi parengti ir įgyvendinti strategiją, kaip padidinti stojančiųjų į šią studijų programą skaičių. Būtina įvertinti vidaus bei išorės veiksnius ir į šią veiklą įtraukti studentus, socialinius partnerius, vadovybę ir dėstytojus.

2. Kolegija turi peržiūrėti ir patikslinti studijų programos ir jos modulių (dalykų) studijų rezultatus, kad jie atspindėtų studijų programos pavadinimą, aiškiai nurodytų absolventų įgyjamas žinias ir įgūdžius bei tiksliau atitiktų Lietuvos kvalifikacijų sąrangos ir Europos kvalifikacijų sąrangos reikalavimus. Kaip šio proceso dalį kolegijai rekomenduojama palyginti šios studijų programos studijų turinį ir standartus su kitomis šalies ir tarptautinėmis studijų programomis.
3. Kolegija turėtų imtis suplanuotų veiksmų ir užtikrinti, kad dėstytojai ir studentai suprastų, kaip turėtų būti vykdomas mokymas, vertinimas, kokių žinių ir įgūdžių, tikimasi, turi įgyti studentai, kad parodytų, kokia pažanga pasiekta kiekvienais metais studijuojant pagal šią studijų programą.
4. Kolegija turi parengti plačią dėstytojų pedagoginės kvalifikacijos kėlimo programą, įskaitant, bet neapsiribojant, užsienio kalbų įgūdžių gerinimą.
5. Kolegija turėtų peržiūrėti ir, prireikus, patikslinti studentams siūlomas specializacijas, kad jos geriau atitiktų pramonės keliamus reikalavimus ir naujausius technologinius pokyčius.
6. Peržiūrėti ir kasmet atnaujinti studijų programos dokumentaciją, kad ji atspindėtų šiuolaikinę komercinę praktiką ir naujausius mokslo, technologijų ir reguliavimo pokyčius.
7. Peržiūrėti baigiamųjų darbų gaires, kad jos išsamiai atspindėtų rezultatus, kurie būtini norint įgyti profesinio bakalauro laipsnį.
8. Kolegija turi parengti tikslinę taikomųjų tyrimų metodiką. Dėstytojams ir studentams sudaryti galimybes dalyvauti taikomųjų tyrimų darbe.
9. Kolegija turi užtikrinti, kad studentai žinotų, kokia tvarka pateikti skundą arba apeliaciją dėl akademinio sprendimo.
10. Būtina rengti reguliarius dėstytojų posėdžius, kad visi suprastų studijų programos struktūros visumą, jos tikslus ir uždavinius.
11. Kolegija turi imtis priemonių ir užtikrinti, kad studentai būtų daugiau įtraukti į studijų programos kokybės užtikrinimą.
12. Kolegija turėtų užtikrinti aktyvesnę ir veiksmingesnę Studijų programos komiteto veiklą vykdant įprastus išsipareigojimus ir atsižvelgiant į šias rekomendacijas, taip pat užtikrinti, kad studijų programa atitiktų studentų ir ūkininkų bendruomenių, kurioms jis teikia paslaugas, poreikius.

<...>

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)