



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Kazimiero simonavičiaus universiteto

STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS

ORGANIZACINĖS INOVACIJOS IR VADYBA (621N22003)

VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT

***OF ORGANISATIONAL INNOVATION AND MANAGEMENT
(621N22003)***

STUDY PROGRAMME

at Kazimieras Simonavičius University

1. **Dr. Mary Lyn Glanz (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Dr. Kristiina Tönnisson,** *academic,*
3. **Prof. Dr. Vulfis Kozlinskis** *academic,*
4. **Ms. Vijolė Satkauskienė,** *representative of social partners,*
5. **Mr. Rimvydas Labanauskis,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator - Mr. Pranas Stankus

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2016

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Organizacinės inovacijos ir vadyba
Valstybinis kodas	621N22003
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Vadyba
Studijų programos rūšis	universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antra
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (1.5), Iššęstinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	90
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Organizacinės vadybos magistras

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Organisational Innovation and Management
State code	621N22003
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Management
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (1.5) Part time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	90
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Organisational Management

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. Aims and learning outcomes of the study programme	5
2.2. Curriculum design	6
2.3. Teaching staff	7
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. SUMMARY	11
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	13

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 following key stages: 1) *self-evaluation and self-evaluation report prepared by a higher education institution (hereafter – HEI)*; 2) *visit of the review team to 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 the external evaluation report of a study programme, SKVC takes a decision to accredit the study programme either for 6 years or for 3 years. If the evaluation is negative, the programme is not accredited.

The programme is **accredited for 6 years** if all the 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 the 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 *during* the visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	Master’s theses, graded.
2.	Information about staff employed on a full-time basis requested.

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

KSU is a private university established in 2003, reorganised in 2012 (after change of owners).

Studies at KSU take place in Vilnius and Klaipeda. The “Organisational Innovation and Management” programme is run in Vilnius.

The programme under evaluation is implemented by the Business School as well as other four first cycle programmes (Entrepreneurship and Management, Business Management, Marketing and Advertising, Aviation Management). The Business School was established in 2013. KSU has only 595 full-time and part-time students in total. The expert team visited university on 17/03/2016. *However, the on site visit did not reach its full potential as meetings with alumni was not organised.* Team feels this is of extreme importance for the curriculum evaluation and must be organised for a future successful review of this programme.

1.4. The review team

The review team was put together according to the *Description of experts’ recruitment*, approved by order No. 1-01-151 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 17/03/2016.

- 1. Dr. Mary Lyn Glanz (team leader)** Dean of Graduate Studies for Glion Institution of Higher Education and Les Roches-Gruyère University of Applied Sciences (Switzerland),
- 2. Dr. Kristiina Tõnnisson** Director of EuroCollege, University of Tartu (Estonia)
- 3. Prof. Dr.habil.oec. Vulf Kozlinskis** Director of PhD Program (RISEBA), Professor of Latvia University of Agriculture (Latvia),
- 4. Ms. Vijolė Satkauskienė,** Director and owner of JSC “Verslo barometras”, Vilnius and Utena departments (Lithuania),
- 5. Mr. Rimvydas Labanauskis,** PhD student in Economics at Business Management Faculty, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University (Lithuania)

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Aims and learning outcomes of the study programme

The study programme aims and learning outcomes are well-defined and published on the KSU website. The main stated aim of the Organisational Innovation and Management master's programme is to train modern management specialists able to address the goals and challenges posed by the innovative knowledge economy.

The aims and learning outcomes of the programme are formulated according to the officially stipulated current developmental needs of the country (Lithuania strategy 2030). A number of the cornerstone concepts of the programme are backed up by the research results of

recognised scientists in the field of entrepreneurship and management (e.g. Hisrich et.al. 2008, Timmons and Spinelli 2007).

The study programme aims and learning outcomes meet requirements of the Dublin Descriptors (defined as part of the Bologna Process) and the guidelines for preparing self-evaluation report by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The primary aim of the programme complies with the generic requirements of the Master's level programmes in Lithuania. According to the formulated aims, the programme should result in the development of multidisciplinary competences. One aim, however, requires more detailed attention. It states: "to provide systemic methodical knowledge enabling to plan the learning process independently, improve personally and improve the environment, use conceptual management knowledge as well as analytical, critical and creative thinking skills..." This aim is complex and difficult to quantify in a meaningful way. 'Improve personally and improve the environment' is especially difficult to quantify and is value-laden. Refining the aim for instance to cover specifically the analytical and critical skills required for the theoretical part of master thesis is more useful even if this is then related to other aims that refer to other desired outcomes.

Additional evidence that the aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies, the level of qualification awarded is needed through comparisons of the programme curriculum with similar study programmes in other Lithuanian universities or abroad.

The title of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualification offered are compatible, but the current version of the title rather implies that the curriculum is focused on organisational innovation, while in reality it is more focused on management. Therefore the current formulation of the aims and objectives requires some improvements.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design meets legal requirements. 8 subjects worth 6 ECTS each make up a compulsory part of the programme. 4 elective subjects of the same volume each are offered, out of which students can choose 2. 30 ECTS in the curriculum are devoted to the final thesis. The idea of a joint curriculum in organisational innovation and management is embedded in the principle of interdisciplinarity that is known to better promote creative and innovative thinking of learners. The programme structure generally ensures that students develop respective competences: in the modern organisational theory, innovation, entrepreneurship and leadership.

The Master's programme is 3 semesters long in case of a full-time track and 4 semesters long in case of a part-time track. In either option, the programme is worth 90 ECTS (as a

minimum). The length, structure, final thesis, and curricular subjects meet the formal requirements.

The course descriptions are prepared in an appropriate way. The course content is consistent with the level of studies, and the recommended literature sources include somewhat contemporary items in for instance such study courses as Management Research Methods and Leadership and Human Resource Management. indicating that recent scholarly debates are reflected in the study process.

Sufficient attention is devoted to preparation of a final thesis which is a good sign. The elaboration of Master's theses starts on the 2nd semester that allows students to capitalise on the relevant knowledge acquired from the study courses. The Expert panel had an opportunity to analyse final theses during on site visit. Topics of the theses that were defended in 2015 matched with the programme content. At the moment of evaluation, however, only 7 theses were completed which is a too small number to make generalizable conclusions. In addition, high differentiation in grading was observed; namely, 2 theses were graded "10", 2 theses got "5", another 2 got "8", and 1 got "9". Such differentiation shows that grading system working properly

For further development of the programme design it is advisable to enrich comparisons of the current curriculum with other similar programmes in Lithuania and abroad (currently this is done only partly), to select relevant benchmarks and keep up with them.

As we mentioned above, it is necessary to consider changing the title of the programme or strengthen the organisational innovation part in the curriculum. As title of program started with keywords "organisational innovation", it must be reflected in the content of program. At present only one subject - Workplace Innovation (6 ECTS, offering alternatively) is directly related to Organisational Innovation. While it is possible and likely to discuss that many other courses content are connected with organisational innovation at present the programme structure suggest that it is more related to a straightforward Management programme.

2.3. Teaching staff

At the moment of preparation of the self-evaluation report, there were 10 staff members: 4 professors, 4 associated professors, 2 lecturers (one of whom has a doctoral degree). Relative to the number of admitted students, i.e. 10 of which 7 are graduates (within two years after receiving a diploma), it could be stated that there are way too many educators. Yet, one should also admit that this number coincides with the number of subjects in the study programme. The teaching staff structure (degrees, academic positions) fulfils the legislative requirements.

Several positive points can be highlighted in connection with participation of the staff members in the ERASMUS mobility programmes. The educators were trained in evaluation of the learning outcomes, developing new teaching methods, etc. They also take part in scientific conferences, international projects, etc. albeit these activities are decreasing gradually. For instance in 2015 only one staff member took part in international certificate conference (compared to 6 in 2014), and there was no participation in scientific projects in 2015.

The main question remains, however, how to distinguish the research activity focused on the study programme-related fields given that most of the staff members are employed on a part-time basis. No evidence was available to review team about the pedagogical development of the programme teaching staff, or any system that the staff participated in to review and improve the existing programme. Therefore it is unclear if KSU creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme; at present 9 out of 10 staff members hold doctoral degrees, and this figure is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes. The c.v.'s of teaching staff show their experience is related to the study field. Because program is only 3 years old, it is too early to analyse teaching staff turnover.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The size of KSU premises is sufficient for the small number of students. Offices of various firms and some shops (on the ground floor) operate in the same building which is unusual.

All classrooms are equipped with multimedia facilities; students have unlimited access to the internet. Specialised software for collecting information and processing information are available (MS Windows 7, MS Office 2003, Open Office, Acrobat PDF reader, 7-zip, CDBurnerXP, Opera, IE7, Paint.net, PrimoPDF, RIVILE, IBM SPSS) Access to a variety of scholarly databases like EBSCO, EMERALD and others is ensured. In order to improve the supply of literature, KSU cooperates with other libraries and scientific organisations. Yet, it is questionable how often the students use these resources. Experts did not find enough evidence on the wide use of the databases. Further, the experts question how sustainable the facilities and learning resources are given the small number of students that the programme serves. Master-level students can use the same facilities as the bachelor students. The KSU library is rather small, but there are sufficient online resources to service students' studies. The program, undergoing an evaluation does not include an internship or other practice experience.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The study process was difficult to evaluate because as of 17 March 2016 there were no students admitted to the programme. The first and last graduation of students from this programme was in 2015. This significantly compromised the review of the programme beyond a review of documentation.

The Master's programme accepts applicants who hold a Bachelor's degree. For those applicants whose 1st level degree is in other fields, it is necessary to pass additional Bachelor-level core courses (up to 30 ECTS). The admission requirements are clearly stipulated and available on the KSU homepage.

So far, there has only been one admission in the academic year 2013/2014 (no admission in 2014/2015). With such a small number of students, it is hard to create the appropriate scientific and learning environment (also considering that most of the staff is employed part-time).

KSU management attempts to facilitate development of student start-ups, but this cannot replace the necessary elements of the research work; there has only been one start-up so far. The students who study part-time cannot take part in the ERASMUS mobility programmes. The students of the programme are provided with the academic and social support. Study course descriptions are well-prepared; they contain all the requisite information, up-to-date literature sources, and details of the assessment system employed, aims set and outcomes expected thus also supporting conditions for successful independent work.

Academic advisory plays an important role in the learning process. Consultations stand for 8-9% of each credit point. The students also receive certain amount of financial support. For instance, 5 students received the tuition fee discount of 30% as socially disadvantaged persons. The course descriptions suggest that learning outcomes of students are assessed using the cumulative assessment system. This system allows recognising potential problems that arise during the learning process in time.

The study process organisation – classroom meetings during weekends – is convenient and preferable for the students. The study process for part-time students lasts 2 years, 2 semesters per year; each semester is 4 months long; 1 extra month is planned out for the examination sessions. However, deeper involvement of the students into research activities must be developed.

All the students of the programme were employed, although the self-evaluation report contains no information about career paths of the recent graduates. The meeting with alumni (7 graduates) was not organised during the visit which made the evaluation harder. The experts did

not have a possibility to discuss the issues of study quality, perceived learning outcomes and other questions with the graduates. Meetings with alumni must be organised for the curriculum evaluation. The experts had a possibility to read through 6 out of 7 MA theses. The topics corresponded to the programme field. The grades reflected overall quality of these works. It is worth mentioning that theoretical parts of the theses could be considered too descriptive.

It is recommended that for any successful future review of this programme both graduates and students must be available for interview.

2.6. Programme management

The Internal Quality Assurance Policy in KSU is built on ISO 9001:2008 standards although it was noted by programme administrators that this system was not always a good fit with educational quality requirements. The main role in managing the study programme rests with the Programme Committee. The committee is responsible for introducing new programs as well improving existing programs. The committee is responsible for evaluating the content of courses and the recommended literature (as mentioned it was the weak point of the subject descriptions). From the organisational viewpoint, the programme is subordinated to and offered by the Business School. All the practical matters connected with the programme implementation are solved by the full-time student coordination. The coordinator is responsible for technical organisation of the study process, starting from preparing classrooms to collecting results of the student achievements.

The main role in managing the study programme rests with the Programme Committee. The students' feedback must be taken into account in order to assess the level of management and to suggest potential improvements. It is mentioned in the self-evaluation report that the student feedback surveys are conducted. However, there is still insufficient information about results of the surveys.

The main function of the Programme Committee is to plan and develop the study programme and its courses. The committee summarises opinions from all the stakeholders about the curriculum, evaluates changes and innovations in the study area with the purpose to include this information into curricula, etc.

A programme coordinator is responsible for organising the study process. The programme under evaluation is subordinated to and offered by the KSU Business School, but the main person who is responsible for all the organisational functions, preparing classrooms, collecting results of the student assessments, etc. is the study coordinator who works part-time.

The programme is under evaluation for the first time, therefore the main source of information for suggesting improvements in the curricular design is the internal evaluation.

Meetings with business representatives showed that they were included in program improvement. After visiting KSU experts conclude that it is possible to observe elements of internal quality assurance subsystem. More attention must be paid for attracting students into the study programme since it is the question of survival. Measures mentioned in the self-evaluation report are considered by evaluation team to be somewhat insufficient.

For ease going forward it is recommended that more attention be given to adopting Higher Education guidelines e.g. ESG than continuing development of Internal Quality Assurance Policy based on ISO 9001:2008 standard.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To compare the study curriculum with similar programmes in Lithuania and abroad (using benchmarks) in order to develop the programme.
2. To discuss the title of programme (or change its content) for ensuring closer connection of the title with the curriculum's content.
3. More active attraction of local and foreign students is absolutely necessary for sustainability of the programme under evaluation.
4. It is necessary to take into account the students' assessment of different aspects of the curriculum and show these results in the self-evaluation report more clearly.
5. Experts strongly recommend improving students research skills (including the ability to work with scientific literature).
6. Experts recommend to strengthen connections with alumni and make alumni participation more active in implementation and development of study programme.

IV. SUMMARY

The self-evaluation report, especially some of its parts, e.g. subject description, is well-prepared. The report provides with necessary information about the state of the curriculum under evaluation. The aims set and outcomes expected are well formulated and are published on the KSU homepage.

The staff members employed in the programme comply with the formal requirements, however they mainly have part-time agreements with KSU and their scientific track record for the period 2013-2015 is decreasing.

The facilities and learning resources are acceptable, but only due to the extremely small number of students.

The supply with facilities and learning resources is adequate given the number of students in KSU, which is rather small in the university in total and extremely small in the programme under evaluation.

The main problem of the programme is the number of students and the measures for overcoming it described in the self-evaluation report that can be considered unsatisfactory.

The study course descriptions are prepared on a good level; information in the descriptions preconditions successful independent work of the students.

Defended theses (7 in total) fit within the programme fields. Grades reflected quality of the theses quite well. Theoretical part of the theses must be more analytical than descriptive.

The meeting with the programme alumni was not organised, hence in their evaluation the experts could not take into account opinion of the graduates about important aspects of the programme implementation.

Overall this programme has been evaluated mainly on documentation which is acceptable, and some input from administrators and teaching staff, who last worked on the programme some two years ago. There has been no contribution from students or graduates at all in the evaluation which has significantly compromised the panel's abilities to review all aspects of the programme. The review panel accepts the programme is in its early years and has had a halting start, but advises that no future review can be successful without the participation of people who have experienced the course as students or graduates.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Organisational Innovation and Management* (state code – 621N22003) at Kazimieras Simonavičius University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Teaching staff	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
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:

Mary Lyn Glanz (team leader)

Grupės nariai:

Team members:

Dr. Kristiina Tönnisson

Prof. Dr. Vulfs Kozlinskis

Ms. Vijolė Satkauskienė

Mr. Rimvydas Labanauskis

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Kazimiero Simonavičiaus universiteto studijų programa *Organizacinės inovacijos ir vadyba* (valstybinis kodas – 621N22003) vertinama teigiamai.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
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)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Savianalizės suvestinė, ypač kai kurios jos dalys, pavyzdžiui, dalykų aprašai, yra gerai parengta. Joje pateikiama reikiama informacija apie vertinamos studijų programos būklę. Nustatyti tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai yra gerai suformuluoti ir skelbiami Kazimiero Simonavičiaus universiteto interneto svetainėje.

Studijų programos personalas atitinka formalius reikalavimus, tačiau daugelis dėstytojų universitete dirba ne visu etatu, todėl jų 2013–2015 m. mokslinės veiklos apimtis mažėjo.

Materialiųjų išteklių kokybė priimtina, tačiau iš esmės tik dėl ypač mažo studentų skaičiaus.

Aprūpinimas materialiaja baze ir metodiniais ištekliais pakankamas, atsižvelgiant į Kazimiero Simonavičiaus universiteto studentų skaičių, kuris yra gana mažas apskritai ir ypač mažas vertinamoje studijų programoje.

Pagrindinė programos problema yra studentų skaičius ir savianalizės suvestinėje aprašyti šios problemos sprendimo būdai, kurie neatrodo tinkami. Dalykų aprašai parengti gerai; juose pateikta informacija sudaro sąlygas studentams sėkmingai savarankiškai dirbti.

Apginti baigiamieji darbai (iš viso 7) atitinka studijų programos sritis. Įvertinimas gerai atspindi šių baigiamųjų darbų kokybę. Teorinė darbų dalis turi būti labiau analitinio, o ne aprašomojo pobūdžio.

Susitikimas su studijų programos absolventais nebuvo suorganizuotas, todėl vertindami studijų programą, ekspertai neturėjo galimybės išklausti absolventų nuomonės svarbiais programos įgyvendinimo klausimais.

Apskritai, ši studijų programa įvertinta daugiausia remiantis dokumentacija, kurios kokybė priimtina, ir administracijos bei dėstytojų, kurie šią programą dėstė prieš maždaug dvejus metus, pastabomis. Į programos vertinimą nebuvo įtraukti nei studentai, nei absolventai, todėl ekspertų grupė neturėjo pakankamai galimybių įvertinti visų programos aspektų. Ekspertų grupė

pripažįsta, kad studijų programa nauja, todėl dar neįsitvirtinusi, tačiau rekomenduoja į jos įgyvendinimą įtraukti ir studentus bei absolventus, taip siekiant palankaus studijų programos vertinimo ateityje.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Tobulinant studijų programą, rekomenduojama ją palyginti su panašiomis studijų programomis Lietuvoje ir užsienyje (atsižvelgiant į etaloninius pavyzdžius).
2. Reikėtų apsvarstyti studijų programos pavadinimą (arba pakeisti jos turinį) glaudesniam programos pavadinimo ir turinio ryšiui sukurti.
3. Būtina aktyviau pritraukti vietos ir užsienio studentus, siekiant vertinamos studijų programos tvarumo.
4. Būtina atsižvelgti į tai, kaip įvairius programos turinio aspektus vertina studentai, ir aiškiau atspindėti šiuos rezultatus savianalizės suvestinėje.
5. Ekspertų grupė ypač rekomenduoja gerinti studentų tiriamojo darbo gebėjimus (įskaitant gebėjimą dirbti su moksline literatūra).
6. Ekspertai rekomenduoja stiprinti ryšius su absolventais ir aktyviau juos įtraukti į studijų programos įgyvendinimą ir tobulinimą.

<...>
