



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

UTENOS KOLEGIJOS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS "*SVETINGUMO VADYBA*" (*valstybinis
kodas – 658N90001*)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF "*HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT*" (*state code -658N90001*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at UTENA COLLEGE

Review' team:

1. **Prof. Lyn Glanz (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. Livina Agita,** *academic,*
3. **Dr. Lorraine Watkins-Mathys,** *academic,*
4. **Mr Linas Pučinskas,** *representative of social partners'*
5. **Mr Vasaris Prunskas,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator -

Ms Kornelija Bukantaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba

Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Svetingumo vadyba</i>
Valstybinis kodas	658N90001
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Turizmas ir poilsis
Studijų programos rūšis	Koleginės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	3 metai
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	180
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Verslo vadybos profesinis bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2014-09-01

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Hospitality Management</i>
State code	568N90001
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Tourism and Recreation
Type of the study programme	College studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	3 years
Volume of the study programme in credits	180
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Professional Bachelor of Business and Management
Date of registration of the study programme	01/09/2014

© 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.....	5
1.4. The Review Team.....	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	6
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	6
2.2. Curriculum design	7
2.3. Teaching staff	9
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	10
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	11
2.6. Programme management	11
III. RECOMMENDATIONS*	17
IV. SUMMARY	18
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	20

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	Student Complaint Handbook (In Lithuanian Language)
2	Student Coursework Assessments
3	Student Handbook for Final Thesis

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

The programme reviewed is the **International Joint Study Programme of Hospitality Management** which is delivered jointly by **Utena University of Applied Sciences (Utena UAS)**, a Lithuanian state institution of higher education offering programmes in social, biomedical and technological sciences and **Rezekne Academy of Technologies (RTA)**, a Latvian state institution of higher education offering study programmes in the fields of human and social sciences, manufacturing and engineering. The programme is delivered in the English language.

According to the pre-visit documentation both institutions have been engaged in international cooperation with each other for a long time; and based on their long-standing relationship and respective international experience they undertook in 2012 an EU funded Feasibility Study into the Preparation and Implementation of Joint Study Programme in the field of Hospitality Management (SER, p.4). This led to the validation of the Joint Degree programme in Hospitality Management. The delivery of said Joint Programme was accredited to run from 23 April 2014 until 1 July 2018 by order No.SV6-25. Approval and licence for running the programme in Latvia was granted by the Latvian Ministry of Education on 27 August 2014 until 18 July 2019 by order No. 04048-82.

According to the pre-visit documentation received and in the interview with management staff during the visit the panel were informed that applications and enrolled students on the programme have declined in line with the overall enrolment trend in Lithuanian higher education institutions. The management team outlined clear plans for growing the programme as a distance learning programme which could be more accessible to international students and students located outside of the region. The panel felt that this was a good strategy to counter the falling numbers on the programme.

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 10/05/2017

- 1. Prof. Lyn Glanz (team leader)**, *Retired Dean of Graduate Studies for Glion Institution of Higher Education and Les Roches-Gruyère University of Applied Sciences (Switzerland);*
- 2. Prof. Livina Agita**, *Director of Research Institute of Social, Economic and humanities of Vidzeme University of Applied Sciences (Latvia);*
- 3. Prof. Lorraine Watkins-Mathys**, *Dean of Faculty of Design, Media & Management of Buckinghamshire New University (United Kingdom);*
- 4. Mr Linas Pučinskas**, *Managing director, founder, co-owner; upscale restaurant "Verkiiai" (Lithuania);*
- 5. Mr Vasaris Prunskas**, *student of Vilnius University, study programme Business Finance (Lithuania).*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The pre-visit documentation clearly articulated the aim of the International Joint Study Programme of Hospitality Management (JSP HM): *“to train a professional who is able to work in a dynamic multicultural and international market, who understand communication, organization and management of the services in companies in hospitality sector and is able to work/act responsibly, creatively and innovatively in ensuring quality of the services provided”* (UK SER, p.5). The international focus of the programme was confirmed by both teaching staff and students during exchanges with the panel. The Rezekne programme management representative on the programme management team also confirmed the international perspective of the programme.

The programme is geared to meet the needs of the local society which has a history based in industrial production. The area has been identified as an EU commission priority region and the programme under review responds to the call to introduce a service based economy to the area. The partnership with Rezekne gives an international flavour to the programme while making a case for increased expertise in hospitality Management within the Baltic States. The title of the programme is appropriate and reflective of the programme’s aims, learning outcomes and content. These are in line with other programmes in hospitality management within Lithuania as well as more broadly in the European context of Higher Education.

The aim and learning outcomes of the programme fit with the mission, operational objectives and strategy of both institutions, required professional competencies and the Dublin descriptors for bachelor studies. Both the pre-validation documentation and the website information (<https://www.utenos-kolegija.lt/en/studies-program/hospitality-management>) listed 16 Programme Learning Outcomes (LOs) which are clearly mapped to meet the overall programme aims. These LOs fall into 5 areas as specified in the ‘Descriptor of Study Cycles’ (First Cycle, Order No. V-2212, November 2011):

- 1) Knowledge and its application
- 2) Research skills
- 3) Special abilities (plan, organise, implement and evaluate practical activities)
- 4) Social abilities (communication, cultural and professional understanding, ethical and professional conduct)
- 5) Personal abilities (take responsibility for own professional conduct and learning etc.)

The LOs cover acquiring, understanding and applying industry and relevant subject specific knowledge (Descriptor 1) as well as a broad range of skills, professional standards, attitudes and behaviours appropriate for a hospitality professional operating in an international environment

(Descriptors 2-5). To this end, they fit with those required for type and level of cycle as articulated by the Lithuanian Order.

Limited details of the programme are made available to the public on the website: <https://www.utenos-kolegija.lt/en/studies-program/hospitality-management> and is still being completed.

Details of the programme are made available to the public on the website: <https://www.utenos-kolegija.lt/en/studies-program/hospitality-management>.

Social partners in meeting with the panel felt that aim and LOs of the programme meet the state, societal and labour market needs overall and add particular value by exposing graduates to international experiences and developing their foreign language (English) skills. Social partners emphasized the need for hospitality and tourism graduates that had entrepreneurial skills (Recommendation 1).

The management team told the expert panel that they saw globalization as both a problem and an opportunity for the programme. Demographic factors have led to falling student rolls but the team thought that the opportunity to offer courses by distance could be a possibility to build their student base. The international nature of the programme has led to the development of local expertise both in remote teaching through e-courses and in administration at a distance. They emphasized the need for SMART learning outcomes that can be applied unambiguously in a cross cultural context and this has been achieved. They also noted the programme suffered from internal competition within the institution from other similar programmes and that a merger of programmes is under consideration. At present the programme is offered on a full time basis only, though the management team said this was now under review.

Future plans for the programme seem well thought through. The management team seem well aware of both strengths and weaknesses of the programme and are actively working through these challenges with their partners in Latvia. To this end the aims and outcomes of the programme are undergoing continuous active review.

2.2. Curriculum design

The Joint Study programme has been developed with due regard to the legislative requirements (Lithuanian, EU and Baltic States' Agreement on Recognition of Education programmes of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia). The credits awarded for the award and the level of studies on the Professional Bachelor programme are consistent with the type and level of studies. The subjects studied on the programme are appropriate and prepare students well for a career in hospitality management. Planned exchanges with social partners, between the Lithuanian and Latvian

partners as well as feedback from surveys obtained from the student body on the programme ensure that feedback and evaluation of the curriculum is obtained regularly.

The programme delivers 180 credits (ECTS) with no module less than 10 credits. The programme meets the requirements for minimum credits required for Practice, Final Thesis modules and learning hours. The programme provides a mixture of theoretical, practice-based learning in the field of management and business administration as applied to international tourism and hospitality management. The curriculum is clearly divided between the two institutional partners in Lithuania and Latvia drawing on respective partners subject offering and makes space also for ERASMUS exchanges. In this way, the curriculum offers a well-structured international mobility programme. There does not appear to be repetition within the programme. There is good scope for students to acquire practice at each level of the programme in both Lithuania and Latvia. In addition, the curriculum allows students to gain practice in other international locations provided by social partners outside of the Baltic states.

The expert team noted that many excursions, which were highly regarded by students, tended to gravitate toward the larger centres in Lithuania with less emphasis on smaller enterprises springing up within the region. Given the programme has a responsibility and focus on this regional area, the expert team would like to see contacts developed more locally, especially in regard to looking at how the hospitality industry can be instrumental in regional development and for this aspect to be incorporated into the curriculum. Similarly, many Faculty are imported from the larger centres on a contract basis. This can mean that their professional contacts are not local. The tendency of Faculty was to look outward to the larger centres and beyond, and there was insufficient recognition that for incoming international students from e.g. Latvia, the local economy does represent an international experience. The expert team heard that there was a certain internal competition between programmes for input and alliances with the most interesting local businesses. This is understandable in a small area, but should perhaps provide an impetus to seek out new enterprises locally for industry input for students. The curriculum could be enhanced in line with the recommendations made on LOs section by including an Enterprise course within the contents (Recommendation 1). This would assist in meeting the regional development needs of the local region. Furthermore, the integration of tools such as booking management and ticketing systems into the curriculum has commenced; but this needs yet to be completed and will ensure that students of the programme would be able to meet the technological requirements of the tourism and hospitality industry. There was evidence throughout the modules on the programme of practice-informed teaching and benchmarked teaching methods which were applied that were disseminated at international conferences.

Overall, based on the review of the pre-visit documentation and interviews with students and social partners, the content of the modules, practice and internship opportunities and international mobility enable the learner to achieve the intended learning outcomes of the programme. The panel found that the content of the curriculum is informed by latest thinking, technologies and approaches.

2.3. Teaching staff

The staff teaching on the International Joint Study programme meet the legal requirements as set out in the Official Gazette, 2011, No 9-399. The pre-visit documentation received (staff cvs and SER) confirm that staff hold a Masters qualification as a minimum, there are the required number of staff with a PhD qualification teaching on core and compulsory modules; no less than 10 % of the subjects in the study field are taught by scientists or scholars; and over half of the teaching staff have more than 3 years relevant practical and pedagogic work experience in the subject area being taught. Teaching staff turnover examined over the last 3 years is sound. The number of Professors has remained stable at 2; the number of Docents has increased from 2 to 5; and the number of Lecturing staff has increased from 4 in 2014-15 to 20 by 2016-17. There is, therefore, a robust provision of teaching staff to support the programme.

A list of staff's research and conference attendance provided at the panel's request during the visit as well as teachers own description of their scholarship activities and plans shared with the panel on the day provided evidence of the teaching staff's engagement in scholarship and updating of current practice in the field. The teachers described attendance at ERASMUS conferences, writing of articles, participation in ERASMUS mobility and engaging with social partners to design practical exercises. Teachers met by the panel were clearly engaged with the students, using a variety of teaching methods to do so, including practical exercises and case studies; and had their well-being and future employability at the forefront of their thinking. The students interviewed confirmed that teachers used the web platform MOODLE weekly posting notes and articles for them. A demonstration of MOODLE was also made to the panel during the day and the teachers are offered 2 workshops per year to up-date their skills by one of the experienced teacher-user of the system. There is a common learning platform in Latvia also so that students using MOODLE find a shared experience when using the platform, whichever country in which they study. Students on the programme informed the panel that teachers taught them how to correctly cite given articles and materials and course-works seen by the panel affirmed this. However, when asked by the panel, students were unable to name academic journals that they found useful in their research for coursework. This gave the panel some

concern that teaching staff were sometimes directed more towards practical needs rather than academic rigor and cutting edge industry practice (Recommendation 2).

The programme management team confirmed the implementation of a plagiarism software for checking the students' academic writing standards for the final thesis. However, the coursework inspected during the panel's visit did not demonstrate that the plagiarism software was being applied on coursework prior to the final thesis writing. This is something that would be helpful to do, so that students can be familiarised with the plagiarism software before final thesis stage (Recommendation 3).

The programme self-evaluation report identified that some teacher's had a lack of English knowledge; and the panel noted that whilst some teachers interviewed spoke English well, students reported to the panel that some teachers translated English articles in class. There was evidence from the programme management's own evaluation and also the international mobility opportunities for staff seen in the staff development report (list) that systematic support is being put in place for teachers to improve their level of English and enable them to teach their subject at the required level in English. The pre-visit documentation (Annex 3, List of teachers) showed that teachers on the programme are engaged in research and scholarship, including the publication of academic articles, books, teaching materials and presentations at international conferences. Among the staff interviewed by the panel there were a couple of staff who have commenced or are about to commence their doctoral studies. They also reported that Utena UAS provided them with good staff development support. The part-time nature of some of the staff meant that being able to exploit these opportunities was sometimes limited, especially, if they were practitioner/consultants. Where teaching staff are also employed by other universities, however, they were able to benefit from wider staff development and research support than that provided by Utena UAS alone. This brought benefits to the individual as well as the joint study programme.

There was a balance of teaching staff in terms of gender and age and no issues noted on staff turnover (Annex 3). Staff interviewed told the panel that some of them also work in other state universities and this allows them to transfer experiences and good teaching practices from these other institutions into the teaching delivery on this programme.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The panel inspected the learning and teaching resources during their visit. We found the teaching rooms to be adequate in size and well equipped for class-room based activities. There were new practice facilities (guest rooms, front-desk for booking guests in and out and small practice

kitchen and hospitality venue). Whilst these were only small they did allow for good practice sessions to be undertaken and evaluated. The College should see how it can further maximise the use of these facilities, especially the kitchen and small hospitality venue as these from the Panel's observations, seemed not to be fully utilised.

The institution has a suite of rooms, equivalent to a small apartment that can be used for housekeeping teaching. This practical space was kept to the highest standard and was a particularly good resource for this programme.

There was one computer room where students could be taught and practice particular software programmes e.g. a booking system. Wifi was available within the institution. A virtual learning environment (VLE), Moodle, has been introduced and workshops to help staff gain the necessary skills to develop and up-date the Moodle site for their subject were available 2 x per year (see evidence above). Students can access lecture notes, articles and other module details from the VLE (confirmed by students interviewed). This provides scope for the programme to meet its ambitions for growing the e-learning elements of the international joint study programme but will require further development and investment for this to advance the ambitions.

The panel visited Utena public library (a 5 minute walk away). The programme management team confirmed that an agreement with the public library in Utena provides both dedicated book and hard copy journal resources for the programme as well as access to the general book stock and other library resources. The panel were able to see both the dedicated space and book and journal stock available for the students and staff on the programme. Students and staff confirmed that they also access to international databases for undertaking their research both in Lithuania and Latvia.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The entrance requirements reported in the SER meet legal requirements. They are based on successfully completing secondary education, achieving the selection criteria for entry onto the JSP-HM. These are compliant with the respective institution's general requirements for entry onto Professional Bachelors programmes (First Cycle programmes). The Panel noted that the competitive points averages of students admitted onto the programme has been increasing as quantified in the Self Evaluation Report (p. 23):

Competitive Points Averages of Students, Admitted to JSP HM

Year	Average in state-financed places (VF)	Average in non-financed places (VNF)	Average VF, VNF
2014	0	1.6	1.6
2015	4.9	0	4.9
2016	6.46	2.5	5.66

Source: SER, 2017, p.23

Furthermore, students admitted in 2016 to the state financed place had a considerably higher score than those accepted on a non-financed place (SER, p. 24). The programme management team confirmed to the panel that English language requirements for undertaking the joint study programme in English is level B2. The entry requirements, however, were not found on the given website links provided in the self-evaluation document (when panel member clicked on link). It is recommended that this information is made easily accessible on the website and in English, Latvian as well as Lithuanian language (Recommendation 4).

Based on the data presented to the Panel in the SER report (p.24) it was evident that the highest average progression point was 8.17 the lowest was 6.08. The average progression point is at about 7.125 point. Thus a student, having entered with a competitive point 0.56, re-studies separate subjects in the second year. Furthermore, a student, having been admitted with a competitive score of 0.6, studies a new subjects of the 3rd semester of the 2nd year. During the period assessed only 1 student suspended their the studies.

Taking into account the feedback from students, staff and interview held with the SER and Management team the panel concluded that the programme management is robust and strengths and weaknesses of the programme are openly discussed within the team. In general, there is a culture of discussion with and process of collecting feedback from key stakeholders (gleaned from interviews with students, staff and social partners obtained by the panel) that enable the programme management to meet challenges. The quality system is generally sound and responsive. Students and teachers reported that they feel able to use the system to bring in new ideas and to challenge dissatisfaction with elements they find unsatisfactory. This appears to work internationally, with the quality system operating across both institutions involved in the programme.

Students told the panel that they are encouraged to take part in a variety of scientific and applied practice activities which are made available via the curriculum (see Annex 1, JSP HM Study

Plan with mobility), visits to social partners and excursions. The international joint study programme is organised in accordance with the *JSP HM Implementation Agreement* (Annex 5). Students reported that they receive strong academic and social support. Teachers were readily available in and after class as well as by email offering guidance on their learning and practice. Students fed back that they also felt well supported by the international office who provided them with clear guidance regarding their international mobility and support during their international practice and/or exchange. At the same time the management team expressed some reservations about sending students abroad in their first year. Students themselves said this had been a learning experience that they had found challenging but rewarding. The expert team suggest some form of 'buddy system' be introduced between students of different years prior to their first international experience to help prepare for the time abroad. Students confirmed that information on module electives was made available to them and they often decided collectively which electives to follow as a cohort. Based on the pre-documentation received and discussed with the SER team the panel concluded that Practice internships are regulated by the *Descriptor of Utena UAS Students' Practice Organization Order* and confirmed at Academic Board (SER, p.25). Furthermore, the programme management team affirmed that placements are monitored and supported by the Faculty supervisor, assigned academic tutor and placement work supervisor.

Students described to the panel the placements that they has completed both abroad and in home-based practice organisations and their experiences in the exchange programme between the 2 institutions of the joint study programme. They felt that practice (internships) and mobility for the joint study programme was well organised and supported. They were enthusiastic in describing how the programme helped them to engage becoming internationally experienced and gain "practice-based" learning via the programme.

The assessments scrutinised by the panel in the module descriptors outlined in the modules (Annex 2 of pre-visit documentation provided) varied in terms of detail but provided sufficient information to demonstrate that students were being offered a variety of assessment types that enabled them to discuss theoretical aspects and their application to practice within the field of hospitality management. As noted in 2.3 above, teachers use a variety of teaching methods, including excursions and practical exercises. They also used social partners as resources for student projects. The system for assessing student achievement was clearly articulated overall in the module descriptors and the panel found evidence in the sample course-works reviewed during the visit that they were overall appropriate in measuring learning outcomes. Furthermore,

the Lithuanian representative and teachers seen by the panel confirmed that both teachers from Lithuania and Latvia had the opportunity to discuss and review the student achievement on the programme. However, the panel did find coursework on the day of the visit where grades and written feedback did not always match (e.g. excellent grade of '9' when feedback clearly identified gaps in student's work found in service quality assessment sample). This can be easily addressed by enabling teachers to discuss assessment feedback and grades at the Joint Study Programme Board (Annex 2) and organising workshops for teachers to share good practice around feedback and evaluation (Recommendation 5).

As noted above, a variety of support is provided to students. This includes both general study support and specific subject related support via Faculty/Department tutors and subject tutors who offer office hours for consultation (the latter confirmed during panel interview with students). Students had not yet completed their final thesis by the time of the visit but had submitted their thesis proposals, which drew on both their academic interests and practice experiences. The students interviewed also spoke how they had been able to participate in international conferences organised by Utena UAS. The panel felt that there were good opportunities and bases for students to engage in research and that there was scope for the Department and Programme Committee to incorporate this as an agenda for future planning and development.

At the time of the Panel's visit in May 2017 the programme had not as yet produced its first graduates, having commenced only in 2014-15. Nor, was it possible to review the performance of students on the Final Thesis as students had not completed this work by the time of the visit. So, it was not possible for the Panel to comment on the programme's employability outcomes for students. The indications, however, from the Panel's discussions with both social partners and students are that there is a demand in the market place for graduates in hospitality with good English language skills and practical knowledge of hospitality. There was strong evidence of both these aspects being taught to students on the programme.

From the data presented on achievement the following was noted. Wastage was low with only 2 students in total having dropped out of the programme for personal rather than academic reasons (SER Report, p.24). All other students progressed from one study year to the next. Learning outcomes Progression are monitored and evaluated bi-annually by reviewing student achievement and performance levels. These reports are prepared by relevant Study Departments. The results show that students with lower competitive scores (0.56) struggle more with their

performance having to re-study separate subjects in the second year of study whilst those with a competitive score of 0.6 took up new subjects in their 3rd semester of year 2 (SER, p.24).

2.6. Programme management

Utena is the Coordinator responsible for the JSP-HM programme whilst Rezekne Academy is a Programme Partner (as per *JSP-HM Implementation Agreement*, Annex 5). This means that Utena is responsible for JSP-HM management, coordination and financial management and Rezekne holds responsibility for implementing the programme in Latvia.

A **Joint Study Programme Board** follows the Joint Study Programme Board Regulations (Annex 2) and has been set up to manage the programme in accordance with the *JSP Implementation Agreement, Orders and Statutes* (Annex 5). The Board is chaired by the Deputy Rector for Academic Affairs of Utena and meetings are held 3-4 per year. The minutes of the Joint Study Programme Board are formally recorded. Major stakeholders participate in the JSP-HM meetings.

The **Joint Study Programme Committee** (JSPC) has proportional representation drawn from Utena and Rezekne and organised according to the *JSPC Regulations* and is chaired by the Utena Head of Department (Annex 2). The Committee membership includes stakeholders from respective partner institutions as well as one student and social partner. Furthermore, the respective partner institutions of the Joint Programme (Utena and Rezekne) have a structure in place locally to manage and assure the quality of the part of the programme run at each partner institutions. There are various levels of management: at institutional, Faculty and Department level. Operational aspects of the programme such as quality of the programme, student data and analytics thereof, are undertaken by the Department. These arrangements were confirmed by the Management and SER team interviewed during the panel visit and also by the Latvian representative from Rezekne. The Panel was satisfied that in these meetings key operational course issues are discussed and relevant course data is analysed with the staff at respective institutions, social partners and student representatives. To this end, these meetings carry out effective internal and external evaluation and enhancement of the programme.

Data and measures used to assure the quality of the JSP-HM course are based on *The Quality Guide* (2012, 2015) and include annual quality review reports (self-assessments) undertaken at teacher, department, faculty and institutional levels (These were provided after the panel visit and confirmed a process for annual monitoring has taken place). These reports include

educational analytics relating to programme monitoring data (enrolment figures, admissions statistics, student achievements, student feedback etc.) and student data (student performance, student progression, student achievement and employment). The programme management team confirmed to the panel that action plans based on the data evaluation are put in place to put in place suitable interventions aimed at quality improvements (SER). All of these are reviewed and evaluated at the JSPC. Thus the internal quality measures are effective and efficient.

When reviewing the programme information on the website the panel found that this was incomplete and not found in English. The panel felt that there was some urgency for the programme management team to address this issue (Recommendation 4).

Overall, the panel concluded that the programme management is sound and responsive. Strengths and weaknesses of the programme are openly discussed within the team and committee structures. There is a culture of discussion to meet challenges. Students and teachers feel able to use the system to bring in new ideas and to challenge dissatisfaction with elements they find unsatisfactory.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Based on the important role played regionally by Small and Medium Enterprises in hospitality management and the forecast growth for tourism and hospitality in Lithuania (Latgale Region Strategy 2030, SER, p.8) it might be helpful if the learning outcomes could incorporate entrepreneurial and skills development more clearly (Report p.7).
2. Based on the evidence provided by students and coursework samples seen, there could be more self directed searching and critical evaluation embedded in the learning that comes from researching and evaluating peer-reviewed academic journal articles, even before the final thesis. It is recommended, therefore, that teaching staff encourage students to undertake research for coursework that has them critically evaluating academic literature in the application of theory to practice (Report, p.8).
3. The demonstration of the plagiarism software during the panel visit illustrated that the implementation of the programme is still in its infancy, although a plan for supporting staff in using the software has been devised. The recommendation of the panel is that the roll-out plan for implementing the plagiarism software includes it being used prior to final thesis work with students also learning how to use the software (Report, p.8).
4. Information and documentation for students about the programme were not consistently available in English. We recommend that all information about the study programme is made available in English to ensure the programme can reach its international audiences and reflects its international ambitions (Report, p.9).
5. There was evidence of innovative teaching methods and engagement of social partners in the delivery of learning. However, there were also mis-matches between feedback and grades awarded to students on coursework. To ensure both good practice can be shared and issues around feedback and grading are consistent and aligned we recommend that the Joint Study Programme Committee organises workshops for teachers to exchange good practice and develop consistent approaches to feedback and grading of student assessments (Report, p10).

IV. SUMMARY

The programme aims and learning outcomes are international in orientation and very practice focused which is well received by both students and social partners. Furthermore, the Panel found the curriculum to be well designed with international mobility and practice embedded within the design that actively helped to promote internationalisation and real-world learning of the hospitality industry. In terms of better meeting the region's needs, however, it would be helpful if the programme could incorporate the development of entrepreneurial skills and enterprise development.

The teaching staff on the programme were praised by the students for their enthusiasms and engaging teaching manner. The Panel found examples of innovative and practice-focused learning which teaching staff delivered into the classroom. Whilst the evidence of teaching and assessment approaches were found to be very good the Panel noted that there was a lack of academic rigour expected from students in their assessment outcomes and self-directed research skills.

The teaching facilities reviewed and evaluated by the Panel were found to be very good. The arrangements with the local Utena Library, situated within walking-distance of the institution, ensured that students had access to the wider learning resources made available by the town library as well as dedicated specialist resources and study space housed within the library. The institution had invested in a number of small but good practice facilities (small kitchen and hospitality venue, front desk operation and guest flats). These provide good simulation and practice opportunities for students. The Panel also found investment in a plagiarism software system and booking/ticketing system. Whilst both these physical and software resources add value to the programmes the Panel felt that there more work needed to be undertaken to further embed and development these tools and resources within the curriculum and students' learning.

The study process is creatively designed and social partners are co-opted onto the programme to provide students with a good international experience in the hospitality and tourism industry. Utena UAS recognises that achieving their international ambitions for the programme and graduates requires them to ensure that their teaching staff have a suitable English language level and are putting in place staff development to make this happen. The Panel noted that the programme was not readily available in English language on the website and more work needed to be done to ensure that this was in place for an international programme.

The Panel found that there was sound quality management in place at Utena UAS. In particular the Joint Study Programme Board and Joint Study Committee between Lithuanian and Latvian partners ensured that good mobility was offered to the students and respective partners offered a curriculum that met the aims and learning outcomes of the programme. Stakeholders, including students, social partners and teaching staff are engaged in regular evaluation of progression and achievement data. This process ensured that programme enhancement was being achieved.

On a final note, the expert panel are only able to report on an interim situation and expect a clearer picture of the programme study process and student performance to emerge when the programme produces its first graduates and final projects are available.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Hospitality Management* (state code – 658N90001) at Utena 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	18

*1 (unsatisfactory) - there are essential shortcomings that must be eliminated;

2 (satisfactory) - meets the established minimum requirements, needs improvement;

3 (good) - the field develops systematically, has distinctive features;

4 (very good) - the field is exceptionally good

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Prof. Lyn Glanz
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Agita Livina
	Dr. Lorraine Watkins-Mathys
	Linas Pučinskas
	Vasaris Prunskas

**UTENOS KOLEGIJOS PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
SVETINGUMO VADYBA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 653N90005, 6531LX076) 2017-08-14
EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-172 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Utenos kolegijos studijų programa *Svetingumo vadyba* (valstybinis kodas – 658N90001, 6581LX005) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	18

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

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

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

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Studijų programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai yra tarptautinio pobūdžio ir labai orientuoti į praktiką, o tai puikiai vertina tiek studentai, tiek socialiniai partneriai. Be to, ekspertų grupė nustatė, kad programa puikiai sudaryta, įtraukiant tarptautinį judumą ir praktiką, kurie aktyviai prisidėjo prie tarptautiškumo skatinimo ir praktinio svetingumo sektoriaus pažinimo.

Tačiau siekiant geriau atitikti regiono poreikius, praverstų į studijų programą įtraukti verslumo įgūdžių vystymą ir įmonių plėtrą.

Studentai gyrė studijų programos dėstytojus už entuziazmą ir patrauklų dėstytojų stilių. Ekspertų grupė rado dėstytojų taikomų novatoriško ir į praktiką orientuoto mokymosi metodų pavyzdžių. Nors ekspertai puikiai įvertino dėstytojų ir vertinimo metodus, jie pastebėjo iš studentų reikalaujamo akademinio tikslumo trūkumą jų vertinimo rezultatuose ir savarankiško tyrimo įgūdžiuose.

Ekspertų grupės peržiūrėti materialieji išteklių buvo įvertinti labai gerai. Susitarus su vietine Utenos biblioteka, kuri yra labai arti kolegijos, studentams buvo užtikrinta prieiga prie gausesnių miesto bibliotekos siūlomų mokymosi išteklių ir specializuotų išteklių bei studijoms skirtų vietų bibliotekoje. Kolegija investavo į nedideles, tačiau geras praktikai skirtas patalpas (nedidelę virtuvėlę ir svečių priėmimo vietą, registratūrą ir svečių numerius). Taip studentams sudaromos geros modeliavimo ir praktikos galimybės. Ekspertų grupė taip pat nustatė, kad buvo investuota į plagijavimo atpažinimo programinę įrangą ir apgyvendinimo rezervavimo sistemą. Nors šie fiziniai ir programiniai išteklių suteikia pridėtinės vertės studijų programai, ekspertų grupė mano, kad reikia dar daugiau pastangų toliau integruojant šias priemones ir išteklius į studijų programos sandarą bei studentų mokymąsi ir juos tobulinant.

Studijų eiga kūrybiškai organizuojama, o socialiniai partneriai pasitelkiami siekiant suteikti studentams geros tarptautinės svetingumo ir turizmo sektoriaus patirties. Utenos kolegija pripažįsta, kad siekdama užsibrėžtų tarptautinių tikslų studijų programos ir absolventų atžvilgiu, ji turi užtikrinti tinkamą dėstytojų anglų kalbos mokėjimo lygį, todėl organizuoja personalo tobulinimąsi. Ekspertų grupė pastebėjo, kad interneto svetainėje nėra informacijos apie studijų programą anglų kalba, todėl šią problemą reikėtų išspręsti, nes tai yra tarptautinė studijų programa.

Ekspertų grupė nustatė, kad Utenos kolegijoje įdiegta patikima kokybės vadybos sistema. Lietuvos ir Latvijos Jungtinė studijų programos valdyba ir Jungtinis studijų programos komitetas užtikrina puikias studentų judumo galimybes ir siūlo tokį studijų turinį, kuris atitinka studijų programos tikslus ir numatomus studijų rezultatus. Socialiniai dalininkai, įskaitant studentus, socialinius partnerius ir dėstytojus, dalyvauja reguliariai vertinant pažangos ir pasiekimų duomenis. Šis procesas užtikrina studijų programos pagerinimą.

Galiausiai, ekspertų grupė pažymi, kad jie pateikia tik preliminarias vertinimo išvadas ir tikisi aiškesnio studijų eigos ir studentų vertinimo vaizdo, kai studijų programą baigs pirmoji absolventų laida ir bus galima vertinti baigiamuosius darbus.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Atsižvelgiant į svarbų mažų ir vidutinių svetingumo vadybos įmonių vaidmenį regione ir prognozuojamą Lietuvos turizmo ir svetingumo sektoriaus augimą (2030 m. Latgalos regiono strategija, SS p. 8), praverstų į numatomus studijų rezultatus įtraukti ir aiškiau suformuluoti verslumo įgūdžių vystymą (SS p. 7).
2. Remiantis studentų pateiktais įrodymais ir peržiūrėtais kursinių darbų pavyzdžiais, rekomenduojama į mokymąsi įtraukti daugiau savarankiškos paieškos ir kritinio vertinimo, vykdant tyrimus ir vertinant recenzuojamus akademinį žurnalų straipsnius, net prieš rašant baigiamąjį darbą. Todėl dėstytojams rekomenduojama skatinti studentus rašant kursinius darbus vykdyti tyrimus ir kritiškai vertinti akademinę literatūrą taikant teorines žinias praktikoje (SS p. 8).
3. Plagijavimo atpažinimo programinė įranga, pademonstruota ekspertų grupės vizito metu, parodė, kad studijų programos vykdymas vis dar yra pirminėje stadijoje, nors jau yra parengtas planas, kaip padėti darbuotojams naudotis šia programine įranga. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja į plagijavimo atpažinimo programinės įrangos diegimo planą įtraukti punktą, kad ji būtų naudojama prieš rašant baigiamąjį darbą, o studentai taip pat būtų mokomi ja naudotis (SS p. 8).
4. Ne visa studentams skirta informacija ir dokumentacija prieinama anglų kalba. Rekomenduojama visą informaciją apie studijų programą pateikti ir anglų kalba, kad studijų programa pasiektų tarptautinę auditoriją ir atspindėtų tarptautinius siekius (SS p. 9).
5. Ekspertams buvo pateikti novatoriškų dėstymo metodų ir socialinių partnerių įtraukimo į mokymą įrodymai. Tačiau taip pat pastebėti grįžtamojo ryšio ir studentų kursinių darbų vertinimo pažymiais neatitikimai. Siekiant užtikrinti, kad būtų dalijamasi gerąja patirtimi ir grįžtamasis ryšys bei vertinimas pažymiais būtų nuoseklūs ir suderinti, Jungtiniam studijų programos komitetui rekomenduojama organizuoti praktinius seminarus

dėstytojams, kuriuose jie galėtų keistis gerąja patirtimi ir parengti nuoseklius grįžtamojo ryšio ir studentų vertinimo pažymiais metodus (SS p. 10).

<...>

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)