



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

**PANEVĖŽIO KOLEGIJOS, ROKIŠKIO SKYRIAUS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS TURIZMO IR LAISVALAIKIO
VADYBA (*valstybinis kodas - 653N80003*)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

**EVALUATION REPORT
OF *TOURISM AND LEASURE MANAGEMENT* (*state code -
653N80003*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at **PANEVEZYS COLLEGE, ROKISKIS DEPARTMENT****

1. **Dr. Craig Thompson** (*team leader*) *academic*,
2. **Dr. Heli Tooman**, *academic*,
3. **Prof. Dr Frank McMahon**, *academic*,
4. **Alina Katunian**, *academic*,
5. **Eglė Dilkienė**, *representative of social partners*,
6. **Agnė Pranckutė**, *students' representative*.

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Turizmo ir laisvalaikio vadyba</i>
Valstybinis kodas	653N80003
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Turizmas ir poilsis
Studijų programos rūšis	Koleginės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (3), iššęstinė (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	180
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Turizmo ir poilsio profesinis bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Tourism and Leisure Management</i>
State code	653N80003
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Tourism and Leisure
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	Tourism and leisure professional bachelor
Date of registration of the study programme	

© 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	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	8
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	9
2.6. Programme management	10
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
IV. EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE (GOOD PRACTICE).....	12
V. SUMMARY	12
VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	14

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 (hereafter – SER) 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.	Summary of the tourism and leisure management specialists demand in Panevėžys region survey

2.	Panevėžys College Tourism and Leisure Management study programme (code 653N80003) list of the changes
3.	Panevėžio kolegijos Vadybos ir verslo katedros Turizmo ir laisvalaikio vadybos studijų programos akademinis personalas 2014-2015 m. (Rokiškyje, Panevėžyje)

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

Panevėžys College is a state higher educational institution established in 2002 by the resolution of Lithuanian Republic Government. In 2013 October 1, 27 study programmes were offered by the College, attracting 1800 enrolled students. The College is divided into 4 departments; Business and Management, Technological sciences, Biomedical sciences, Social Sciences. The *Tourism and Leisure Management* study programme is assigned to Management and Business Department. The Tourism and Leisure Study programme has not been previously been subject to external assessment.

The *Tourism and Leisure Management* Study programme was first offered at Rokiškis Department in 2009. In 2011 and in 2013 the programme was offered only in Panevėžys. The delivery now alternates annually between the two sites, with the curriculum and teaching staff being shared across both campuses. Due to the significant distance between the Rokiškis and Panevėžys campuses and the constraints on available time, it was not possible to visit the Rokiškis campus. However, to enable the visit team to gain an impression of the facilities available, a video of the resources at the Rokiškis branch was prepared and viewed during the site visit to the Panevėžys campus.

Furthermore, the review team was provided with one SER for both campus sites, and though the report included some information specific to the Rokiškis campus, key sections, including the staff, student numbers and curriculum, were not clearly differentiated between the two sites. Given this the review team were not able to make recommendations specific to the Rokiškis campus, other than those contained in this report.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was assembled in accordance with the *Expert Selection Procedure*, approved by Order No 1-55 of 19 March 2007 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education, as amended on 11 November 2011 The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *7th October, 2014*.

1. **Dr. Craig Thompson (team leader)**, *Academic Dean, Stenden Hotel Management School, Stenden University, The Netherlands.*
2. **Dr. Heli Tooman**, *Senior Lecturer of Tourism Management, University of Tartu Pärnu College, Estonia;*
3. **Prof. Dr Frank McMahon**, *Former Director of Academic Affairs, DIT and Director, College of Tourism and Food, Dublin, Ireland;*
4. **Alina Katunian**, *Head of Tourism Department, Vilnius College, Business Management Faculty; Guide, Lithuania;*
5. **Eglė Dilkienė**, *Executive Director, Lithuanian Association of Hotels and Restaurants, Lithuania;*
6. **Agnė Pranckutė**, *student of Aleksandras Stulginskis University study programme Accounting and Finance.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The aim of the study programme and learning outcomes are published in the informational College booklets for entrants, presented in the Career Days events, Lithuanian Study Fairs, meetings with Panevėžys region school pupils, and on five internet sites, and also on the blog of Rokiškis Branch: <http://blog.panko.lt/rf/stojantiesiems/>.

The SER (pp 5) states the objective of the study programme (hereafter programme learning outcome). This learning outcome comprises a series of clear verbs describing what graduates are expected to be able to do (research, plan, organize, assess, manage, apply, communicate). However, the list is long and compound in nature (multiple elements), raising questions regarding the relative importance of each aptitude. It is not clear from the SER, nor from the visit, what level has to be reached in relation to each action.

The initial programme objective was developed according to the Vocational Education and Training Standard for a Tourism Manager (approved by Order No ISAK-1970/A1-279 of the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania and of the Minister for Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania of 8 October, 2007) in 2009, but was modified based on consultations with the industry. During the visit, discussions with the alumni and social partners indicated that the programme may now not be meeting industry needs. There were suggestions that the programme should contain more specific training in reservation systems (though this is problematic given the range of programmes graduates may encounter), in guiding and in dealing with customers.

Levels, as described in the study subject outcomes appear appropriate. In 2011 the programme was modified in accordance with the need to divide the content into modules, of a maximum of 10 ECTS.

The programme team should pay attention to balancing elements dedicated to ‘knowing’ with those dedicated to ‘doing’ (applying, analysing, using). Furthermore, the number of study subject outcomes (often 6 or more) and the assessment of these needs attention, to ensure they are in balance.

There is a clear link between programme study goals, study subject outcomes, study methods and assessment made in the description of subject course (appendix 1) – this is a strong feature of the programme.

2.2. Curriculum design

The SER states the legal framework within which the curriculum has been formed and clearly details how the curriculum complies. The team responsible for preparing the SER stated that surveys amongst both the public and private sector were conducted when the programme was revised in 2009. Discussion with this team demonstrated they were aware of legal requirements.

Study load is spread evenly and is not repetitive. During the visit students expressed satisfaction with the programme, generally agreeing it met their expectations. The alumni reported that there was a difference between the various placements. However, they were not able to identify a strong link between the placement and the stage/ year of the programme in which it took place. For example, placements undertaken in year 1 did not build upon or relate specifically to other content delivered in year 1, meaning the placements were, in effect, unconnected to the main programme.

The content of the subjects is consistent with a professional Bachelor’s degree. Students approved of the large amount of practical components.

The content and methods appear appropriate for the achievement of intended learning outcomes. With a total of 60 students (20 of which are part time) the class sizes are rather small. However, students identified this as an advantage. The SER does not differentiate between the numbers of students at each campus. However, an analysis of table 11 (SER pp 26) indicates there is not a significant difference in the intake or performance attained at each campus site.

A clear link between programme study goals, study subject outcomes, study methods and assessment is made in the description of subject course (appendix 1).

The main issue relating to content encountered during the visit concerned languages. It appears that students are required to follow the language they have previously studied. The programme previously required students to study a second foreign language, but dropped this requirement, in order to alleviate the financial pressure on the programme. However, alumni of the programme reported during the visit that some competency in additional languages (particularly Russian) would be advantageous. The social partners supported this proposition. Moreover, alumni identified that more Lithuanian specific input in the programme would be beneficial (which equates with the industry perspective that the programme may overlooking the potential to prepare graduates to be guides).

2.3. Teaching staff

The SER does not differentiate between the staff associated with each campus. Moreover, during the site visit it was explained that all staff will teach across both campuses as required, and therefore the figures provided are applicable to each.

According to the staff list provided (appendix 2) 35% of staff hold a masters degree, with 6 holding a doctorate, which meets the legal requirements for this programme.

Staff are well qualified, with a good degree of industry experience. Recruitment policies ensure quality is maintained and enhanced (pp 17). The SER team reported that, as a consequence of a good working relationship with the social partners (industry) the programme had no problem recruiting suitably qualified practitioners. Moreover, the SER (pp35) reports that very close connections between Department and employers –Panevėžys County Tourism and Information Center, Rokiškis Tourism and Crafts Center, Rokiškis Regional Museum, UAB “Dorintus” help to improve practical students’ training and preparation.

The staff student ratio (19.4), maximum hours (36 per week) and contact hours (max 18 hrs) are all appropriate. There appears to be a large number of part-time staff involved in the programme, but this is consistent with the small volume of students. The students reported that access to staff was generally good.

The precise turnover of staff is unclear both in the SER and during the visit, with the SER stating only that ‘a change of the working staff in the study programme was observed’ (pp18). However, turnover is supported by student teachers from Kaunas University of Technology Panevėžys Institute undertaking work experience. Age profile is skewed towards higher range (50+).

According to the SER, a robust and supportive programme of staff development is in operation. The SER team reported that the programme commenced a 3 year programme of staff training in 2012, including policies to facilitate and encourage research. Members of the academic team reported they had participated in seminars on preparing learning outcomes and undertaking research. Furthermore, the need to improve the English level of staff had been identified by the academic team themselves, but management had responded by providing training.

From the evidence provided in the SER, the research activity of staff seems appropriate (based on output of 70 articles in 4 years). Staff reported they are encouraged to participate in research and to attend conferences. Staff are also encouraged to participate in international exchanges supported by Erasmus.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

From the video the team was show the facilities appear adequate in size and quality. The SER (pp 20) reports that Panevėžys College Rokiškis branch has 3 buildings, with a total area available for studies of 944,69 sq.m. The College library consists of three branches (2 in Panevėžys and 1 in Rokiškis).

The learning facilities (teaching rooms, reading room, computer room and library) seen in the video appear appropriate. The SER (pp22) reports that the Rokiškis branch includes 32 computers, 19 that are dedicated for studies. However as the site was not visited it was not possible to assess the quality or functionality of these. The academic team reported they used Moodle, and the SER (pp 24) reports that Students of the TLM study programme have

possibilities to use the methodological aids and material prepared by the College teachers through the internet access in the MOODLE environment, in the library or reading room of Rokiškis branch. However students reported that it was actually only used as a mailbox. However, the team were not shown any tourism specific resources.

A range of practical training institutions is listed in the SER (pp 23). Students reported that the practical elements within the programme were good, with a good range of possibilities (museum, travel agent, rural tourism operator, tourist information centre) being available. Thus, some students had received the opportunity to be trained on reservation systems during the practical components, while others had not.

The SER (pp 21) reports Panevėžys College Rokiškis branch has signed contract with Rokiškis Regional Museum, Rokiškis Culture Center, Rokiškis J. Tūbelis Gymnasium, Rokiškis J. Tumas-Vaižgantas gymnasium and in case of need may use these institutions' material and learning resources.

It is interesting to note that the survey of local employers regarding their opinion on employing graduates of the programme (provided to the Review team during the visit) indicated that only 2 out of 11 respondents considered 'college students have sufficient practical skills', with 5 disagreeing with this statement, and 4 responding 'don't know'.

Resources appear adequate. Students expressed an awareness of databases, including EBSCO.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The College participates in the admission process for Lithuanian HE institutions.

Number of admitted students is rather low (with 11 FT and 14 PT students admitted this academic year). Given this yields are generally good, but 6 of 14 (43%) in 2013 is an issue. The low intake gives cause for concern, from both a financial and educational experience perspective. The programme management has developed a strategy of marketing and school visits, designed to increase the intake. Moreover, the SER (pp28) states a project group in Rokiškis branch created and implemented relation to schools strengthening project of professional orientation "I love my work" targeted to help school pupils to get acquainted with professional activities of various professions. However, it is still considered the programme should now engage more closely with the social partners to address the issue of numbers and to develop an integrated strategy.

The SER reports that students are encouraged to participate in research through student society and special events. The students appeared content with their experience, but there is no evidence of a strong or active student society (though this may be reflective of the fact virtually all students are local and therefore have established social networks).

Students are encouraged to participate in exchange and Erasmus programmes. Details of 5 participating students are provided in the SER (pp 28). This number is low as a proportion of total student numbers, and the students reported that pressure on time and finance (in particular the need to undertake part time work alongside study) was the main disincentive.

A range of support (study support, consultations, career support, individual study route, grants) is detailed in the SER (pp 30). Students reported they were aware of the careers centre, but had no

received details of employment opportunities. In addition, the alumni reported they were not aware of an alumni society.

Students reported that details of assessment were available, but were not readily available, and therefore considered that the programme information could be improved.

The SER reports that employment rates are 100% (pp31). However, the alumni reported that finding suitable employment in the tourism sector was challenging. The fact that only 1 of the 4 alumni the Review team met was working directly in tourism supported this opinion.

2.6. Programme management

A Study Programme Committee (hereafter – SPC) monitors across the college the programmes and submits reports to Academic Council. However, during the visit it became apparent that the SPC operates for all programmes within the department and the membership did not currently include a student from the programme being evaluated.

During the visit the College Administration reported that College operated an electronic programme evaluation system, however, students reported they were not involved in evaluation in a systematic way.

The College Administration reported that results from the quality assessment system were reported to the Academic Council. However, the staff were not able to explain clearly how this resulted in changes to the programme.

Students and industry are involved in process, though industry involvement is identified as insufficient in the SER. This opinion is supported by the fact that the social partners the team met, did not include anyone who was a member of the SPC. However, it was apparent that industry partners are actively involved in assessment of the theses, which is a positive aspect of the programme management.

It is evident that quality assurance measures are in operation, but as the above information indicates, their effectiveness may not currently be optimal.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

From an analysis of the documentation provided and evidence gathered during the site visit, the Expert Team wish to make the following recommendations:

1. Work with social partners to review focus and learning objectives of the programme. Identify if the programme could be revised/ refocused to better prepare graduates for employment (locally) in the tourism sector.
2. In consultation with social partners and alumni review the content of the programme to identify if and how certain elements, including languages, customer, specific skills (reservations) should be enhanced.
3. Explore ways to improve the language (specifically English) skills of staff and also their engagement in international exchanges.
4. Consider increasing tourism specific resources, including texts in English.
5. Increase the (upfront) information made available to students, particularly with respect to assessment.
6. Include a student representative of Tourism and Leisure Management study programme on the Study Programme Committee.
7. Ensure that students are systematically involved in electronic programme evaluation.
8. Engage more closely with the social partners to address the issue of admission numbers and to develop an integrated strategy.
9. Increase the number of students participating in exchange and Erasmus mobility programmes.
10. Increase the activity of the career centre.
11. Consider establishing an alumni club/ society.
12. Increase the usage of Moodle.

IV. EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE (GOOD PRACTICE)*

No specific areas of excellence identified

V. SUMMARY

Tourism and Leisure Management is a first cycle (professional bachelor) study programme implemented at Panevezys College, Rokiskis Department. After examining the self-evaluation report prepared by the programme team, the Review team have identified positive aspects of the programme, and also some aspects that require further attention.

Positive aspects

- The College is in a region with strong tourism potential. This is reflected in a strong relationship with industry partners.
- The teaching team are enthusiastic and motivated, to the extent of identifying and pursuing their own development needs.
- The College has a good range and standard of facilities.
- Links with social partners, particularly the tourism information centre, have been used to increase the opportunities available to students.
- Academic structures, including a Study Programme Committee are in place.
- The commitment to offering a part time programme is commendable, and in line with the need to maximise student numbers and interaction with the industry.

Negative aspects

- The current programme objectives may not equate with contemporary industry needs.
- The existing programme may not include all the elements graduates need (including languages, specific skills, customer handling)
- The outcomes from of practice elements need to be sharpened to ensure they meet with industry needs in terms of practical skills of students and graduates.
- The range of tourism specific resources needs to be increased.
- The level of intake is a cause for concern, particularly when the relatively high drop-out rate is factored in.

- The evaluation of programmes needs to be reviewed to encourage the involvement of students. In addition, actions resulting from evaluations need to be made clear to staff and students.
- The college needs to pay greater attention to the care of graduates. Specifically it should consider creating an alumni society to promote sharing of information and opportunities. In addition it should increase the support offered to alumni in finding employment.

VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme TOURISM AND LEISURE MANAGEMENT (state code – 653N80003) at PANEVEZYS COLLEGE ROKISKIS DEPARTMENT 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	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	2
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	2
	Total:	14

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

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

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

4 (very good) - the field is exceptionally good.

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Dr. Craig Thompson
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Dr. Heli Tooman
	Prof. dr. Frank McMahon
	Alina Katunian
	Eglė Dilkienė
	Agnė Pranckutė

PANEVĖŽIO KOLEGIJOS ROKIŠKIO SKYRIAUS PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *TURIZMO IR LAISVALAIKIO VADYBA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 653N80003) 2014-12-12 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-623-2 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Panevėžio kolegijos Rokiškio skyriaus studijų programa *Turizmo ir laisvalaikio vadyba* (valstybinis kodas – 653N80003) vertinama **teigiamai**.

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

* 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)

<...>

V. SANTRAUKA

Turizmo ir laisvalaikio vadyba yra Panevėžio kolegijos Rokiškio skyriuje vykdoma pirmosios pakopos (profesinio bakalauro) studijų programa. Išnagrinėjusi programos rengimo grupės parengtą savianalizės suvestinę ekspertų grupė nustatė teigiamus šios programos aspektus ir tuos, į kuriuos reikia atkreipti dėmesį.

Teigiami aspektai

- Kolegija yra regione, turinčiame geras turizmo galimybes. Tai rodo stiprūs ryšiai su turizmo sektoriaus partneriais.
- Dėstytojų kolektyvas yra entuziastingas ir motyvuotas, gebantis įvertinti savo tobulėjimo poreikius ir siekiantis juos įgyvendinti.
- Kolegija turi daug reikalavimus atitinkančių materialiuųjų išteklių.
- Ryšiai su socialiniais partneriais, ypač Panevėžio turizmo informacijos centru, padėjo padidinti studentų galimybes.
- Suformuotos akademinės struktūros, įskaitant Studijų programos komitetą.
- Pagirtinas įsipareigojimas taikyti ištęstinę studijų formą; jis atitinka poreikį maksimaliai padidinti studentų skaičių ir palaikyti ryšį su turizmo sektoriumi.

Neigiami aspektai

- Programos tikslai gali neatitikti dabartinių turizmo sektoriaus poreikių.
- Esama programa galbūt neapima visų absolventams reikalingų studijų dalykų (įskaitant kalbas, specialiuosius gebėjimus, vartotojų aptarnavimą).
- Reikia sustiprinti su praktika susijusius studijų dalykus, siekiant užtikrinti, kad jie atitiktų turizmo sektoriaus poreikius, turint omenyje studentų ir absolventų praktinius įgūdžius.
- Reikia padidinti turizmo išteklių apimtį.
- Reikėtų susirūpinti dėl stojančiųjų skaičiaus, ypač kai nubyrėjimo lygis yra palyginti aukštas.
- Reikia persvarstyti programų vertinimo klausimą, siekiant paskatinti studentus dalyvauti jų vertinimo procese. Be to, būtina paaiškinti dėstytojams ir studentams veiksmus, kylančius dėl vertinimo.
- Kolegija turi daugiau rūpintis absolventais, tiksliau sakant, apsvarstyti alumnų draugijos steigimo klausimą, kad būtų lengviau dalytis informacija ir pranešti apie galimybes. Be to, Kolegija turėtų labiau padėti alumnams susirasti darbą.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

Ekspertų grupė, išnagrinėjusi jai pateiktus dokumentus ir per apsilankymą surinkusi informacijos, norėtų pateikti šias rekomendacijas:

1. Reikėtų kartu su socialiniais partneriais persvarstyti šios programos objektą ir studijų tikslus, nustatyti, ar būtų galima programą patikslinti ar perorientuoti taip, kad absolventai būtų geriau pasirengę darbui (vietos) turizmo sektoriuje.
2. Rekomenduojama pasitarus su socialiniais partneriais ir alumnais persvarstyti programos turinį, siekiant nustatyti, ar būtų galima (ir kaip) sustiprinti kai kuriuos studijų dalykus, įskaitant kalbas, vartotojus, specialiuosius gebėjimus (*rezervavimas*).
3. Ieškoti būdų, kaip pagerinti dėstytojų kalbą (ypač anglų kalbos) mokėjimą, taip pat padidinti jų dalyvavimą tarptautinių mainų programose.
4. Apsvarstyti galimybę padidinti su turizmu susijusius išteklius, įskaitant tekstus anglų kalba.
5. Pateikti studentams daugiau (*išankstinės*) informacijos, ypač susijusios su vertinimu.
6. Įtraukti į Studijų komitetą *Turizmo ir laisvalaikio vadybos* studijų programos studentų atstovą.
7. Užtikrinti, kad studentai nuolat dalyvautų elektroniniame programos vertinimo procese.
8. Glaudžiau bendradarbiauti su socialiniais partneriais, sprendžiant stojančiųjų skaičiaus problemą, ir parengti bendrą strategiją.
9. Padidinti mainų ir *Erasmus* judumo programose dalyvaujančių studentų skaičių.
10. Suaktyvinti Karjeros centro veiklą.
11. Apsvarstyti alumnų klubo ar draugijos steigimo klausimą.
12. Daugiau naudoti virtualaus mokymosi aplinką *Moodle*.

<...>

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)