



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

**KOLPINGO KOLEGIJOS  
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *EKOTURIZMAS*  
(valstybinis kodas - 653N80006)  
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT  
OF *ECOTOURISM* (state code - 653N80006)  
STUDY PROGRAMME  
at KOLPING COLLEGE**

**Experts' team:**

1. **Dr. Mary Lyn Glanz (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. Eneken Titov,** *academic,*
3. **Mr. Henri Kuokkanen,** *academic,*
4. **Mr. Linas Pučinskas,** *representative of social partners'*
5. **Ms. Indrė Šareikaitė,** *students' representative.*

**Evaluation coordinator -**

***Ms Gabriele Bajorinaite***

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language – English

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Ekoturizmas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	653N80006
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Turizmas ir poilsis
Studijų programos rūšis	Koleginės
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (3); Iššęstinės (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	180
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Turizmo ir poilsio profesinis bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	<b>2011-12-23</b>

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Ecotourism</i>
State code	653N80006
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Tourism and Leisure
Type of the study programme	College
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (3), part-time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	180
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Professional bachelor of Tourism and Leisure
Date of registration of the study programme	23 December, 2011

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

## CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
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
<b>II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2.2. Curriculum design .....	6
2.3. Teaching staff .....	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources .....	9
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	10
2.6. Programme management .....	12
2.7. Examples of excellence * .....	12
<b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## **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.	Changes in the Programme
2.	Chair's of Academic Council opinion about the programme (in written form)

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

Kolping University of Applied Sciences is private higher education institution, providing higher education College studies. In 2012 KUAS started professional bachelor programme in Ecotourism. The external evaluation of this programme is conducted for the first time.

### ***The Review Team***

The review team was completed according *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 11/05/2016.

1. **Dr. Mary Lyn Glanz (team leader)** retired from Dean of Graduate Studies of Glion Institute of Higher Education and Bulle and Les Roches-Gruyère University of Applied Sciences, UK.
2. **Prof. Eneken Titov**, vice rector for academic affairs and professor Estonian Entrepreneurship University of Applied Sciences, Estonia.
3. **Mr. Henri Kuokkanen**, Research Fellow and Online MBA Program Coordinator at Glion Institute of Higher Education, Switzerland.
4. **Mr. Linas Pucinskas**, Managing director, founder, co-owner of the restaurant “Verkiai”, Lithuania.
5. **Indre Sareikaite**, student of Vilnius College study programme Business Economics, Lithuania.

## **II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS**

### ***2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes***

The general aim of the programme is to prepare modern qualified specialists of tourism and recreation with underlying Christian morality and sustainable development principles in their activities. The aim also indicates the six competencies (communication, specialisation, sustainable development, management, event management and self-development skills) of the graduate. The aim seems to be unique and distinguishes programme from the other Tourism and Recreation field programmes. To support the achievement of programme aim, 22 programme level learning outcomes (hereinafter – LOs) are stated. The LOs seem to be clear, but the Panel would suggest a smaller number of main wide scope programme learning outcomes that cover the entire curriculum with more detailed outcomes confined to subject or module level outcomes (eg. LO “ability to develop ecotourism company products and their marketing strategy” is more suitable for the subject Ecotourism marketing. LOs in programme level should indicate the most important outcomes in general level eg. “Student is able to manage/organise the processes/functions necessary for running ecotourism company” etc.).

College has created variety of possibilities to introduce programme aims and LOs publicly – student fairs, homepage, leaflets, open presentations etc.

According to the SER and interviews with the management, LOs are updated considering the changes in legislation and labour market and LOs are in compliance with professional bachelor level studies general outcomes.

The Panel suggest the name of the programme (Ecotourism) seems to be rather specialist and doesn't reflect the programme aims and intended LOs. It is helpful when the name of the professional bachelor level programme refers to the field of the possible job positions available for the graduates. According to the stakeholders and students, the graduates and students are working as general tourism specialists, because there are no specific ECOtourism oriented jobs offered in the market. A specialist name tends to imply specialist competencies are built on more general competence and so it rises the reasonable question, of whether the graduates are provided with the wider competencies needed to deal with the tasks and jobs offered from the labour market. It is good that the programme offers also the competencies to start his own eco-oriented businesses, but this opportunity is not so clear from the programme aim and might be too narrow to develop a sustainable programme. It is true that the programme may be orientated to perceived future employment opportunities, yet to emerge in the labour market, but even so, some coverage of general tourism knowledge and expertise to address both current and future opportunities is advised.

Moving the early content of the programme to that of a more general tourism degree, showcasing and appraising different viewpoints and approaches, would also allow more debate within the field and encourage a situation where there is greater academic dispute among both students and teaching staff.

Concerning the preparation and the development of the programme, although College analysed the other same study field curricula, College also brought out that benchmarking according to the exact specialization is not possible, because there are no similar curricula in Lithuania. Ecotourism might be unique specialisation in Lithuania, but there are quite a many similar programmes abroad and benchmarking with those would help College to further develop and update its programme.

## ***2.2. Curriculum design***

The curriculum design meets general legal requirements – size of the programme and modules, number of courses per semester, amount of the practices in curriculum etc. All the supportive materials describe how the requirements are fulfilled concerning the full-time studies. The compliance with the requirements concerning the part-time studies were not wider presented either in presented documents or interviews with the SER team or teachers.

Curriculum is divided into four subsections– general subjects, study field subjects, elective subjects and internship subjects. Study subjects are classified, but the base of spreading is not rationale eg. general subjects section (23 ECTS) consists of studies of foreign language (17 ECTS) and philosophy oriented subjects (Philosophy and Christian Social Teaching) (6 ECTS)

and doesn't cover the topics characterising the level of professional bachelor studies (academic writing, research methodology, organisational behaviour, communication, IT etc). The study field section consists of many different subjects from IT and TQM to Planning of Ecotourism Business. The titles of the electives are not named and the connection between this section with the aim and LOs of the programme stays weak - the aim of the programme refers to the students' ability to successfully combine ecotourism objectives with the different fields (eg. Marketing, finance, psychology etc), but for example psychology is not named in either LOs or study content. Despite Christian Science Teaching directly corresponding to the institutional mission, it is the opinion of the Panel that the 6 ECTS currently given over to Philosophy and Christian Science Teaching should be given over to a proper Introduction to Tourism or similar, where contemporary issues, norms and controversies within the field can be introduced to provide a sound basis for the discussion of ecotourism. This introduction would require at least 6 ECTS to cover the subject adequately. The Philosophy and Christian Social Teaching subject in the opinion of the Panel is better addressed as extra curricular input, or perhaps given fewer ECTS to make way for core tourism input that is currently seen as lacking in the curriculum

The general aim of the internship or practices is to allow student to apply theoretical knowledge into practice and acquire working skills. The Review Panel thinks that the content and the aim of the internship module is unclear and according to the information provided in the SER and interviewed students, the four internships from five are not taking place in the workplace and only some excursions to the companies are provided. Therefore is doubtful whether the aim can be fully achieved. Although the one aim of the study programme is also to "constantly improve and seek to contribute to the sustainable development", the students weren't able to give any example how they use ecology-driven/sustainability valued principles in their everyday life. It allows doubting whether the programme aims and LOs are achieved via the curriculum. The panel would like to see greater application of ecotourism principles throughout the daily life of the college highlighted as reinforcement of taught courses.

The variety of study methods named by the teachers is wide and many interesting and active methods like storytelling, creative writing, simulations etc were mentioned. Despite of that the course descriptions reflect only general and narrow variety of study methods and are repetitive subject-by-subject (eg. Analysis, synthesis and interpretation as methods are named almost in every description). It should be also noted that interview with the students demonstrated the lack of critical thinking – methods like discussions and debates to learn argumentation and critical thinking should be stronger emphasised in the programme. To conclude, according the Review Panel, study methods used are appropriate for achieving learning outcomes in minimum level.

Final thesis topics are mostly connected to the study field, although the 3 theses from 8 focusing to the personnel management issues (empowerment, training and staff assessment) and are connected to the study field indirectly.

The content of the programme is traditional (according to the LOs and topics), but the name and the aim of the programme presume and give possibility to update the programme according to the latest achievements in the field.

Review Panel's opinion is that the scope of the programmes is sufficient to ensure LOs. Review Panel finds the the type (College studies) and level (6th) of the studies to be compatible – the minimum requirements are met, but HEI should pay full attention to the necessary improvements given above.

### ***2.3. Teaching staff***

According to the SER the number of the teaching staff has been increased more than three times (from 9 in 2012 to 33 in fall 2015). Annex 2 (SER) provides list of 33 teachers of the Ecotourism study programme, 13 of them only started in 2015. There might be a little confusion in understanding the differences in terms of part-time and full - time teaching - according to the list of teachers given in SER, there are no full time employed teachers, but in the teachers interview some of them said that they are full time teachers. One third of the teachers have doctoral degree, other has master degree, and staff's practical and pedagogical experience and the number is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes.

College provides opportunities for the teachers to participate in different projects. The projects should be more focused to the ecotourism area to support development of teachers' professional development. According to the presented information, College has several educational and education methodology focused projects. Those projects are important, but balance between the pedagogical and profession oriented activities should be gained to ensure the increase the quality of teachers and studies. The College only starts several projects and mostly the teachers' initiative and network are the reasons for the application and financing of the projects. There are also some examples of academic staff participating in the work of several volunteering or professional institutions and associations.

During the interview teachers mentioned College to support their participation in mobility programmes and give lectures in partner universities as well as collect international experience to develop and widen the use of study topics and methods. College also involves foreign experts –lecturers to the studies. Despite of the good examples, the number of incoming and outgoing lecturers is still minimal (1 or 2 lecturers per year) and continuous and systematic internationalisation of study programme should be prioritised.



As concerning the projects, also the teachers' training should offer possibilities to develop pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills. Every year teachers prepare self-evaluation of their development activities and are assessed according to that. Although some activities to support academic staff training and development are described and were named by the teachers and management, the full system (training need (eg. performance review) – plan with budget – assessment – feedback and discussion etc) should be implemented.

Teachers' research activity is sufficient, related to the study programme and/or subject – lists of the activities were presented for Review Panel in SER and some examples were given during the interviews. The number and qualification of the teaching staff is meeting the legal requirements - teachers pedagogical and competencies in specific field (subject) are good to support the achieving of the LOs. The teachers' turnover is reasonable and as a positive result, the number of teachers with practical work experience has increased.

#### ***2.4. Facilities and learning resources***

The College's new house gives students and staff modern working and studying environment. Classrooms of the old house need urgent updating and in some cases also serious repairs should be done to assure safe working or social environment to areas outside of the classrooms, particularly the upstairs balcony. It is accepted this area is not normally open to students. Therefore, the facilities used in the programme are of mixed quality and relevance; the best facilities are adequate in size and suitably equipped with the devices such as boards and projectors necessary for the studies, the old house which Review Panel visited is less so and seems to be out-dated. This might have a negative impact on student motivation for learning. It is understood and accepted that a renovation plan is in place to be implemented in 2016.

As the teachers and students said, the virtual learning environment Moodle platform is used with different functions for the students and lecturers, but according to their descriptions, the possibilities of Moodle system are not fully used. Moodle is established for the supporting of more frequent communication and feedback giving between students and teachers. Students valued teachers readiness to communicate via different channels (facebook, e-mails, other social media), but Review Panel recommends formal communication concerning the studies (formative and summative assessment, home assignments etc).

The College's library has general and basic type books for the main modules of the study programme that Review Panel seen. However, it may be more helpful for student learning and for the teaching staff if more up to date and wider range of programme field oriented resources are introduced and updated periodically. Well-known databases are freely available including EBSCO Publishing and Emerald Management. According to the library visit and

interviews the study field connected e-books and specific databases would be supportive for the students and teachers to better orient such a narrow field as Ecotourism.

Based on information provided in SER, the programme includes five practices in total. Four of them are not work-place practices and only Final professional practice takes place in company. College has contacts with the associations connecting companies valuing responsible business and intermediates the practice possibilities for the students through the College website. During the interview, the students confirmed that it is student's responsibility to find place for final practice. According to the students and social partners, the finding of the suitable and study field connected practice places or job is not easy. Some of the alumni are working in tourist information centres and other tourism related places, where successful coping doesn't necessitate narrow specialisation to the ECOtourism. According to the requirements, the final practice must be linked with the final thesis. To support students to find practice places and pass the practice more effectively, College needs to have clear and for every stakeholders available practice documentation including information about the aim of the practice, LOs, students tasks, partners' roles and responsibility, assessment procedure and criteria etc.

### ***2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment***

The admission system of the College is in accordance with the central admission system and obtained secondary education is main requirement. The competitive score is calculated and candidates are ranked. Additional requirements for the candidates applying for the state funded places are established (passed exam in Lithuanian language and literature and B1 level foreign language). The number of the potential students (KUAS as first or second choice) has been decreased more than twice - 114 applicants in 2014 and only 50 in 2015. Number of admitted students has decreased, but not so dramatically (from 41 to 31). Competitive scores of the admitted students are low and may reflect the entrants' poor preparation and may lead to the dropouts. In self-evaluation Report the College argues "Most students who enter the KUAS with low competitive score, study successfully and graduate". This might also refer to the problem, that studying in KUAS is too easy. Students brought out that they don't spent much time for self studies per week.

Students can participate in different research oriented activities – student conferences, some projects. Students' activity and willingness to actively participate in different events and initiate them is valuable. Different activities should support and develop also students' academic research knowledge and skills. The College organises student conference to involve students to the research activities and in 2015 seven presentation by the students from Ecotourism study programme were made. According to the conference presentations list given in SER, the

presentations were more connected to the tourism sector in general and weren't focused on the study field – ecotourism. After reviewing the final thesis Review Panel noticed the lack of academic writing and research skills expressed by students. Review Panel would recommend the College to systematically involve students to the research activities to improve their skills.

The College supports students' mobility mostly through Erasmus+ (only three outgoing and four incoming students within three academic years 2012 – 2015) and Kolping Society. Whether the amount of Erasmus+ funding depends on different external aspects, the possibility to go for a practice to abroad supported by the Kolping Society, is good possibility for the students. In the light of decreasing funding, the College should think about short cycle (eg. several weeks) student mobility projects and try to find additional funding for the internationalisation from EU or other donor organisations.

KUAS provides student counselling on study, student counselling on issues of professional career, social support and financial assistance. The co-ordinator of the student support service is a professional counsellor and has determined hours for meeting students. Subject based counselling is mostly offered by the teachers and is often informal based on good relationships between students and teachers. Effective counselling expects also counselling competence and special training or education. Student counselling system should first find out students who need counselling and match them with competent advisor. There are no state funded places in this study programme from autumn 2016 and financial assistance and support has become more important. Beside the financial advise, the College provides scholarships for the students. According to the order of scholarship, the sum of money is divided among many students - amount of one student's scholarship is small (100 or 200 euros per student per year).

The College has established students' assessment principles: validity, reliability, clarity, utility and fairness. Based on the information collected from the interviews, those principles are not familiar for personnel. At the beginning of each semester, teacher should inform students about the course performance assessment procedures outlining a detailed course programme. Course descriptions presented for the Panel are not include either assessment criteria and requirements or assessment procedure. Just the assessment "formula" (how many points or % the student will collect during the study) is not informative enough to support students' learning process. Formative assessment should be more emphasised and supported by the College. The qualification board is formed to assess the students' final thesis. Board consist of five people – one teacher responsible for the implementation of the programme, one teacher from another HEI and 3 representatives of the social partners. The committee also includes a teacher with a doctoral degree to ensure academic research competence.

There are only several alumni of this study programme, thus it is still impossible correctly assess whether the professional activities of the majority of graduates meets the study programme expectations. Those who came to the meeting with the Panel were working in travel agencies, tourism information centers and some alumni have their own small business or they plan for entrepreneurship

In general, the Review Panel sees the College's efforts in improving the study process and starting new study quality assurance activities - the beginning is done but it requires more efforts in implementing the plans fully into practice. According to the quality circle, the feedback collecting with assessment of activities and systematic improvements should follow the planning and conducting the studies. Therefore, the study process overall ensures the provision of the programme in satisfactory level.

## ***2.6. Programme management***

In 2015 College established a new Quality Guide based on the requirements of the "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area". The coordinator of Quality and Research Department is responsible for study programme evaluation. Communication between Centres and administration helps to share the information and to collect necessary data for the programme organisation. Once a month a Centre organises the meetings where also the study programme quality issues are discussed.

It could be stated that the programme evaluation process involves stakeholders, though, as Review Panel heard during the interviews, in a rather informal way and not systematically. Programme management meetings take place monthly and are minuted, but it was said to the Panel that the social partners are asked to participate in the meetings if necessary and some rather occasional discussions are held. College surveys the students, teachers and alumni to collect necessary feedback about the study programme quality. Main role to use collected information remains to the teachers who are responsible for updating the courses. Teachers can make proposals for the Academic Council to change the courses and study programme. The Programme managers point out there is an established formal quality network. However, interviews with administration, SER team and teaching staff showed that for parties involved it is not clear who and to what extent is involved in the programme management and which are the exact responsibilities of the parties. The mainly part time teachers in particular appear to attend to teach their subjects with no clear understanding of the means to get changes to their courses adapted formally. The only clear message about a joint approach to the subject came from the teachers' generalised agreement that they taught at the institution because of a Christian philosophy held jointly with other staff. The suggestion was this enabled a coming together of

ideas on changes in the programme with very little conflict. In the panels opinion this is an insufficient substitute for properly managed professional educational quality systems, and has led to an emphasis on an evangelical philosophy rather than subject substance in the early curriculum. According to the description from the management team and academic staff, the programme management and feedback collections base on informal process (mostly discussions, random talk with the students/alumni/employers etc) and is not consistent and systematic. To the Panel there appeared to be a lack of healthy debate about programme development that should be stimulated by a proper quality structure, rather than relying on an informal organic model that implies there is always agreement.

Attestation of study programmes is organised once every three years to collect and give feedback for the teachers about the quality of description of the subject, the subject compliance with study objectives, individual and practical students assignments, use of assessment criteria and availability of methodological and technical supply. Academic staff were not able to describe the attestation process in detail - who are the members of attestation committee, how the members are prepared to assess the subject's quality, how and when the committee's suggestions reach teacher and will be applied.

The programme management process should be reviewed and re-mapped by the management team and the external (recommended) expert, concerning the requirements of the HE, general good practice and HEI's values and goals. The HEI should implement an internal quality effectiveness and efficiency assurance system with the short- and long-term action plans, goals, principles and responsibility sharing.

## **2.7. Examples of excellence \***

\* if there are any to be shared as a good practice

### **III. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Benchmarking with the similar study programmes is highly recommended to modernise the studies and include attractive and necessary topics. Systematic methodological work should be done to encourage students to think critically and consciously use principles of responsible activity. Good examples from the College being responsible business are expected.
2. The HEI should think about adding Christian social values into the social support area of student life, but not so much into the obligatory subjects of the curriculum. It is hard to measure fairly and is value bound. It should be replaced by subjects that could underpin the main subject like an introduction to tourism that gives a wider based view of tourism and could give students skills to debate contemporary practice. In general, the course descriptions need urgent updating. The description should reflect reality and help student to fully understand how the LOs will be achieved and assessed.
3. Overall, the facilities and learning resources need modernization, especially concerning the old schoolhouse. Classrooms of the old house need urgent updating and in some cases also serious repairs should be done to assure safe working environment. The library international book and journal stock needs updating and a greater acknowledgement of and focus on the virtual learning environment is required across the teaching and learning.
4. Student admission numbers are quite low; consequently, marketing and admission procedures need to be reviewed to ensure greater sustainability and prevent decreasing returns.
5. There is constant lack of systematic use of quality principles and process management ability in study process and its management. Feedback system is built on the informal discussions and relations, but should also involve principles of continuous improvements and evidence base. External advice may be needed to build up study quality assurance system.

#### **IV. SUMMARY**

Teachers and students alike expressed the impression of the institution as a family. This has advantages and disadvantages. The advantage is students feel supported and cared for. They are pleased with the attention and interest that staff show in their education. Staff state the feeling of community is a major reason for working in the institution. Too informal and “cozy” environment may refer to the lack of critical thinking and the institution needs to look at how healthy it is to have such agreement throughout the institution.

As far as the education on offer is concerned to be a new and important study field in Lithuania, which affects available materials etc. But it is not new worldwide and more reference to global expertise in this area is expected. This can then be compared to the local context. The support that College have from partners shows how important this study field is serviced within the country.

The College’s new schoolhouse gives students and staff modern working and studying environment. Classrooms of the old house need urgent updating and in some cases also serious repairs should be done to assure safe working environment.

The students are being offered stimulating trips and visits where the feasibility of ecotourism is being explored, but there is insufficient critical analysis in the studies. At its basic level, while students have looked at the advantages of ecotourism, the counter balance of alternatives seems to be neglected and to some extent from examples is somewhat unsophisticated. Critical analysis and argumentation are important tools that distinguish bachelor level students from those taking a professional training course.

Also and related to levels of agreement in the institution, the formal quality system needs to be properly constructed. At the moment far too much relies on informal discussion and feedback. This means the programme aims are not yet properly formulated and this has a knock on effect on learning outcomes and the assessment of those outcomes. There is good communication and relationships between students and staff and social partners, but informal communication has not resulted in the level of quality that could be achieved is due to unfamiliarity rather than resistance.

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme ECOTOURISM (state code – 653N80006) at KOLPING COLLEGE is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	2
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	2
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>13</b>

\*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. Mary Lyn Glanz
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Eneken Titov
	Henri Kuokkanen
	Linas Pučinskas
	Indrė Šareikaitė