SKVC

STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus universiteto

KOKYBĖS VADYBOS (621N20004)
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT

OF *QUALITY MANAGEMENT* STUDY PROGRAMME (621N20004)

at Vilnius University

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Prof. Roger Hilyer
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Assoc. Prof. Gyula Bakacsi
	Prof. Dr. Pantelis G.Ypsilantis Prof. Dr. Guenther Dey Prof. Dr. Su Mi Park Dr. Ingrida Mazonaviciute

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	**Kokybės vadyba**
Valstybinis kodas	621N20004
Studijų sritis	socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	vadyba
Studijų programos rūšis	universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	nuolatinės,1,5
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	vadybos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2009-08-17

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	**Quality Management**
State code	621N20004
Study area	Social Studies
Study field	Management
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Cycle of studies	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time,1,5
Scope of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Management
Date of registration of the study programme	2009 -08-17

<...>

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Quality Management* (state code – 621N20004) at Vilnius University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by fields of assessment.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	3
2.	Curriculum design	4
3.	Staff	4
4.	Material resources	4
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	3
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	4
	Total:	**22**

*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.

IV. SUMMARY

The programme aims and learning outcomes are well defined, based on professional requirements, consistent with the Master level of studies and publicly available. The programme gives a broad and solid foundation of skills and understanding. Graduates are able to begin useful work immediately on employment and they have the flexibility necessary to readily extend their skills in directions appropriate to their employment. Consultation and planning processes are in places which ensure that a balance is maintained between the immediate local needs of employers and the obligation to deliver a programme which manifests the intellectual rigour necessary at Master level and provides a solid basis for longer term career development. Staff involvement in real life quality management ensures that they are up to date in their understanding of the needs of the profession. However, programme aims and learning outcome statements are too ambitious and objectives too broad. The claim that specialists of high qualification are prepared is inappropriate. It would be helpful for the programme team to revisit the statement of objectives and learning outcomes with a view to bringing them more clearly into line with the undoubted qualities of the programme. There has been inadequate progress in internationalising the programme since 2005when the visiting experts identified this as an important weakness.

The content of the modules is consistent with Master level studies. The curriculum of the programme is in line with the curriculums of analogous programmes of Western universities. The curriculum design meets legal requirements. The content and methods of the modules are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. There is a flexible, module-specific approach to teaching and learning. There is a clear understanding of the complementary roles of lectures, seminars and workshops in teaching and learning. The curriculum statements are the outcome of a thorough going analysis and consequent replanning across three semesters of the previously accredited programme. The curriculum achieves a coherent, progressive student experience, eliminating overlaps. Staff expertise and thorough consultation ensure rapid response in respect of the curriculum to changes in the external environment of quality management. The only serious weakness is the inadequate role for English in the delivery of the curriculum.

The staff who provide the programme meet legal requirements. They are appointed and appraised according to VU requirements, which are designed to maintain a high quality of teaching provision. Staff are heavily involved in research, in active engagement in real world quality management, in a wide range of personal staff development activities and in active membership of international academic organisations. They have the expertise and experience to deliver a wide range of topics in quality management. They are an integral part of a Faculty which offers a range of disciplines supportive of the Quality Management programme. The age profile is such that the Faculty faces no immediate problem of significant staff changes. By all measures the general standard of teaching is good or very good. Students have, however, expressed some concern over the teaching ability of some teachers. Procedures to assist these colleagues are in place.

The facilities at the Sauletekis Centre, library, teaching rooms, electronic equipment, online resources, are outstanding with no shortcomings evident.

Admission procedures are sound. Entry grades have been increasing and wastage going down. The organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme. The level of detail in the planning is impressive, and gives confidence that the programme team have the delivery of the programme under control. The delivery of the programme, with particular reference to the thesis preparation and production, encourages students to engage in research. Staff student communication is excellent, making full use of the ambitious VU information system. There is excellent provision for social support and for the security of assessment.

However, whereas the detail of module planning, in respect both of content and delivery and of assessment, is impressive, it may be that both are excessively detailed for Master level study. On the other hand, it would be useful to the student for the programme team to publish clear criteria demarking the level of achievement in assessment tasks. As indicated above, some students express concern over the teaching ability of some teachers.

Measures for quality assurance and quality enhancement, both formal and informal, involving all stakeholders inside and outside the Institution, are excellent. Procedures for using feedback in the replanning of learning outcomes, curriculum and assessment are meticulous and diligently applied. The programme is delivered by a group of staff, including staff of other departments, who are quite clearly a team and not a collection of isolated individuals. There is a cohesive core group of staff under charismatic leadership. The team includes employers and other professionals who are seen as social partners. There is a good relationship between teachers, students and graduates.

The only weakness is the concern expressed by some students over the teaching ability of some members of teaching staff. There are procedures in place to help such colleagues, but the Faculty is advised to provide more support for less effective teachers and teachers on the margin of the team.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1. Revise the programme aims, objectives and learning outcomes to reflect more accurately the broad foundation of professional skills and understanding provided, bringing them into line with the undoubted qualities of the programme

3.2. Explore ways of increasing the role of English in the teaching and learning experience of the students.

3.3. Make fuller use of technologies for the online submission of assessment assignments and return of feedback

3.4. Reconsider module descriptions to determine whether teaching plans are too detailed and assessment tasks too many and too small for a master level programme

3.5. Adopt a clear set of assessment criteria for all forms of assessment in use on the programme,

3.6. Seek ways of providing more timely guidance and support for colleagues having difficulties in effective teaching