



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Šiaulių universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS „DAILĖ“
(valstybinis kodas - 621W10012)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF "FINE ARTS" (state code - 621W10012)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Šiauliai University

Review' team:

- 1. Dr. Atis Kampars (team leader)** *academic,*
- 2. Michael Fox,** *academic,*
- 3. Prof. dr. Duncan Higgins,** *academic,*
- 4. Mr Saulius Valius,** *representative of social partners'*
- 5. Ms Anna Lena Bankel,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator -

Mrs Kristina Maldonienė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Dailė</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621W10012
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis	Dailė
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės, 1,5 m.
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	90 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Dailės magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1997 gegužės 19 d.

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Fine Arts</i>
State code	621W10012
Study area	Arts
Study field	Fine arts
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1.5 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	90 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Fine Arts
Date of registration of the study programme	1997 May 19

© 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.....	4
1.4. The Review Team.....	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2.2. Curriculum design	8
2.3. Teaching staff	11
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	13
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	14
2.6. Programme management	18
2.7. Examples of excellence	21
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	22
IV. SUMMARY	24
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	28

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.

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

The study programme of the second cycle Fine Arts (further – the Programme) is implemented by Šiauliai University (further – ŠU). The University carries out university study programmes of all three cycles, formal and non-formal, qualifications updating and re-training programmes, as well as research in the sphere of Humanities, Social, Physical, Biomedical sciences, Technologies and Arts. During the analysed period, the structure of the University was optimised. Since February 1st, 2016, the University consists of 3 faculties, 2 institutes, a library, Art Gallery, administrative services and other divisions. The main institutions of government and self-government are the University Council, the Senate, the Rector and Students’ Representative Office; all of them have

Faculty student and staff representatives. ŠU Statutes were approved by Decree No. XII-6561 of 10th December 2013 of Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania, while University Strategy for Years 2015-20202 was approved by the Council in 2015. The implementation of the study programme Fine Arts is ensured by the Faculty of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (up until 2016-02-01 – Arts Faculty), (further – Faculty), which has 7 departments. The Programme is implemented by the Department of Arts (further – Department), founded by the decision of the Senate in 2016, having reorganised the departments of Fine Arts, Design and Theatre. The review team acknowledge that this is the third review of the MA programme. Last time study programme was evaluated in 2013 and was accredited for 3 years.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. V-41 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *14/March/2017*.

- 1. Dr. Atis Kampars (team leader)**, *University of Business Art and Technology RISEBA, lecturer, Latvia.*
- 2. Michael Fox**, *Limerick Institute of Technology, Head of Design Department, Ireland.*
- 3. Prof. dr. Duncan Higgins**, *Nottingham Trent University School of Art and Design and Bergen Academy of Art and Design, Professor, United Kingdom, Norway.*
- 4. Mr Saulius Valius**, *Founder and CEO, Ekspobalta LTD, Lithuania.*
- 5. Ms Anna Lena Bankel**, *student of University of Applied Arts Vienna, Austria.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The review team had extensive discussion and critical reflection on the programme aims and learning outcomes (LO) with the main aim found SER page 4. The aim of the Programme is *to prepare the artist who has achieved the outcomes of the Programme and who has acquired the appropriate competences, able to create, to evaluate conceptually the socio-cultural phenomena, to operate in interdisciplinary space, to apply unconventional solutions and to work in the area of art and culture.* The review team strongly recommends annual review of these aims to ensure precise delivery and consistent up to date understanding within the field of contemporary Fine Art

practices. The review team think that whilst 23 – 24 subjects is a lot they are clear and concise in all the programme documents and SER and are achievable if the student fully understands the meaning and value of the well-articulated learning outcomes. The review team noted and concurred with the previous evaluation findings 2013 that the considerable development by the University, following the recommendation of the previous ‘Expert Review’ of 2010, in better defining the learning outcomes around the categories (knowledge and its application; ability to carry out research; and special, social and personal abilities), and clearly mapping them to the study programme. The review team found a great improvement, transparency and articulation of all aspects of the LO’s.

The SER explains the modification of the aims after the last accreditation as *„the aim of the Programme was adjusted emphasizing: conceptual thinking, the ability to operate integrally, interdisciplinary“*. The review team welcomes and compliments the programme for this modification along with a clearer articulation central to the aims and outcomes: The concept of Professional painter was changed into more general Artist which reflects more accurately the identity of the creator operating in the field of contemporary art today, as well as creative methods and techniques and newly formulated learning outcomes.

The review team think that the learning outcomes are much clearer following extensive review from 2013 and are consistent with those of MA standards in other institutions. They appear to be aimed at creating a well-rounded graduate capable of engaging with the professional artworld in local, national and international contexts. As with the bachelors programme of Šauliai University the review team think that on-going review and where appropriate modification of the programme title, considering that there is a design specialism included should be considered by the leaders of the Programme. The review team think that at this level of study any employer wishing to employ an MA graduate with expertise in design would expect that graduate to have a MA in Design not Fine Arts. The future programme could benefit from clearer specific information and clarity of the terminology consistent with the field of contemporary Fine Art.

Of note the review team would like to point out how the structure of LO’s follows the guidelines imposed by the ‘Fine Arts Descriptor’ of outcomes. The description of LO’s are clear and understandable and stress the appropriate aspects of MA level – analysis and ability to synthesize (or integrate), and emphasis on aspects of planning and independent self-defined studies. The review team thinks that the programme relates well to the needs of contemporary practice and has specific value and significance for the region and the review team think that the aims and learning outcomes meet the professional requirements and are fully supported and endorsed by the graduates and employers. Consistent with the previous evaluation 2013 the review team also received very

positive feedback when they interviewed employees who emphasised that the alumni poses a desirable combination of practical skills, continuous active involvement with the field of studies, and manifold creativity that translates to various activities.

The review team noted and acknowledges that the SER clearly declares the compliance of the programme with the following documents:

- *the description of Studies in the Field of Fine Arts (2015),*
- *the descriptors of Study Cycles (2011),*
- *the order of Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania “On the Approval of General Requirements for Master Degree Study Programmes” (2010).*

The review team thinks that on-going review, implementation and necessary responsive measures can be implemented to ensure the students fully appreciate the purpose and value of the learning outcomes, specifically how the students voice and feedback promotes this process. The review team also would welcome transparency for the students in how the intellectual and practical developments are integrated from Bachelor to Master’s level. The review team also would welcome stronger integration between theory and practice when considering such diverse ‘Fine Art’ practices and ensuring the same critical aesthetic, technical and intellectual rigor across both. This will ensure consistent critical analysis and contextual awareness in the quality and standard of the Master’s thesis across the programme. The review team were able to sample final exam work and found that the samples achieved the LO’s and demonstrated a high standard comparable with benchmark standards in other institutions.

The review team acknowledge the considerable on going work the programme has taken in referencing new ŠU guidelines for the faculty, and consistently revise national and European laws and guidelines in arriving at their learning outcomes including the European Higher Education Space Framework of Qualifications for the second cycle, Level 7, and Level 7 of the qualification requirements defined in Lithuanian Framework of Qualifications. As highlighted in the previous evaluation (2013) the review team are not convinced the name of the programme and the qualification offered are compatible with each other and would welcome clarification across all programme documents. The review team think it is important to stress that the international benchmark for Fine Art as distinct from the American term Fine Arts – including design – is described as addressing practical and theoretical concerns through a broad spectrum of two-dimensional, three-dimensional and time-based media, materials and processes. This is an activity of creative reasoning that is dependent upon flexibility of ideas and methodologies informed by an

awareness of current critical debates. In particular the integration between theory and practice to develop self negotiated independent learning.

2.2. Curriculum design

The programme meets the national standard, consists of Total 90 credits. The principles show correspondence with the national requirements: the amount of field subjects is 84 ECTS comparing with the required 60 (SER table 5, p.9). The composition of subject groups accent the specialism: 33 ECTS are allocated for specialization studies, 21 ECTS for ‘obligatory’ field subjects, and 30 ECTS for Master’s Final Project.

The programme is divided into four groups of subjects:

- Artistic Project Activities: this covers areas such as conceptuality, contextuality, integrity and professionalism. This also includes the development of critical thinking, generate respect for cultural. Ethnic and social diversity
- Artistic Research Activities: this aims to provide students with the ability to conduct artistic research which helps locate their practice in the context of the contemporary art world.
- Integral Art Activities: aims to provide students with the necessary collaborative and organisational skills to realise individual and group projects, in an interdisciplinary environment.
- Activities for personal and professional development; this is designed to develop the student’s ability for self-criticism, self-development and to continue to generate ideas which are intrinsically motivated. These four subject groups appear to be much richer and of a greater theoretical standard than those criticised by the previous review team.
- The programme designers seem to have elevated the subjects from being instrumental to being much more critically and contextually based. It is also important to ensure that these separate groups are not perceived as separate components but that they are properly integrated to form a singular coherent direction for the student’s work to develop *the content of subjects (modules) and study methods enable to achieve the intended learning outcomes;*

The method of distribution of study subjects is rational thus reflecting the tight frame of a study period (1,5years). The Programme also attempts to involve 8 ‘alternative’ subjects with total planned volume of 6 ECTS (Experimental Graphics; Experimental Painting; Design of Graphic Communication; Visual Anthropology; The Artistic Object of a Book; Visual Communication Project; Interdisciplinary Art Expression; Contemporary Art Criticism) to provide an insight to deeper processes of research or professional creative activities (p.10). Each of these alternative courses has volume of 3 ECTS and is planned for the first or second study semesters. The positive and rational solution is the inclusion of “Research on the Topic of Master Project” course in the

second semester (6 ECTS) that directly prepares the students for the elaboration of the Master's Final Project in the third semester. (SER Annex 1)

The scope of the programme is sufficient to meet the learning outcomes provided that there is enough scope for the student to develop the appropriate level of critical and theoretical skills in a holistic form. The review team want to acknowledge how the programme now embeds a more integrated interdisciplinary aspect of practice beyond introduction to a new medium or process that is evidently enhancing the Master's level learning experience of the students. The review team want to acknowledge how the curriculum design and content is being reviewed on an on-going basis for example during the meeting with SER group it was clearly articulated how changes in functional design was enhanced e.g. they now do not have 2 specialisations: textile and leather, replaced by a more integrated interdisciplinary content.

The study subjects and modules are equitably spread across the years giving the students a balanced workload and the module content is consistent with the level of studies. The review team want to highlight the need for on-going development of the programmes need to address the integration between the theory and practice based content of the programme. Theoretical skills could be developed to enable students to articulate better their ideas and concepts. The programme should address the course content to ensure it continues to meets the future needs of Master's level standards with specific reference to contemporary discourse in art and philosophy, professional development skills and critical writing and research skills. The programme should continue to review the theoretical content and its integration within all aspects of the programme, the review team recommends that there is engagement with wider socio-cultural contexts in all aspects of curriculum design, content and delivery.

The review team found that in general the content of subjects corresponds to the type and cycle of studies. The review team would welcome review and where appropriate revision of the content of the study subjects to focus the curriculum and can articulate how it is predominantly directly related to specialty studies. There are two courses 'Integral Art Project' and 'Research on a Master's Thesis Theme', both of 6 credits, in the curriculum planned to provide integration of knowledge of the 'other specialty'. Both courses are located in the second semester thus leaving very small amount of time for critical reflections before the focus on graduation thesis in the third (final) semester. Only a very small portion of the courses depart from the specialty studies, thus the scope of knowledge provided by the programme is potentially rather narrow for MA studies. The programme should continue to review the theoretical content and its integration within all aspects of the programme, the review team recommends that there is engagement with wider socio-cultural contexts in all

aspects of curriculum design, content and delivery. The review team felt that the programme would benefit from the introduction of a positive culture of critical discourse of the individuals relationship to others (ethical studies).

Overall the review team still found some imbalance between the practical and theoretical elements within the content of the programme. The review team believes that there is still a main obstacle (previous evaluation report 2013) for the achievement of the learning outcomes in the length of the programme that limits students' possibilities to critically evaluate the standard characteristics of specialty and procedures of studies and, consequently, make research. The review team found an enhancement of independent or negotiated learning more evidenced as an integrated element of the MA programme. Students are given clearer guidance and structure for developing independence and responsibility for their own actions at a professional level and to international standards, not as an extra mural activity, but as an established learning outcome. As previously recommended the review team would welcome continual focus on maintaining and developing this aspect of the programme.

The array of knowledge and skills provided to students was felt to be appropriate however the would welcome constant revision and review to ensure the most relevant and up to date practice and theory are fully integrated across all aspects of the curriculum to provide a holistic and appropriate learning environment. The review team thinks that there is still room for development with the number of electives that still offer a potentially narrow specialty of subjects rather than additional subjects in the curriculum. The review team found that the research content of the programme could still be improved (previous evaluation report 2013) and the standard of written dissertations in some cases could be more integral to the students learning (samples by the review team found the dissertations ranged from short descriptions of the practical process that lacked a more in depth contextualisation, analysis or synthesis and critical evaluation consistent with Master's level). In particular the review team think that progress is being made with student centered learning and would welcome further progress with how students are fully encouraged to develop self-negotiated studies across the curriculum.

Implementation of recommendations, made in the previous review, particularly in relation to developing the quality and quantity of the theoretical elements have made a significant improvement in assisting this programme compare favourably with similar programmes internationally. Contextualisation of art practice through the integration of theory and practice one of the core issues in contemporary Fine Art education. This development needs to be extended by continual engagement with the international Fine Art community through active engagement in

international discourse. Fine Art is a rapidly evolving and changing field and while substantial progress has been made to bring this programme in line with international examples of artistic, academic and technological best practice there is no room for complacency and continual efforts need to be made to stay in touch with current advancements.

The review team would also recommend further integration of critical rigor in the discussions about the student's ambition and expectation within national and international contexts of creative production. The review team recommends that the curriculum continues to evolve and respond to ensure it places emphasis on contextual awareness, research and practice that reflects engagement in international contemporary discourse in art and philosophy, professional development skills, critical writing and research skills.

2.3. Teaching staff

The staffing legal requirements set in the General Requirements for Master's Degree Study Programmes are met. The Programme employs 9 staff members: 3 professors, 5 associated professors, 1 lecturer. The review team think the composition by ranks is impressive and would also recommend that SU ensures staff development, professional development and renewal plan is maintained. The composition of the staff team also very adequately meets the requirements of no less than half of the study fields are taught by scientists or recognised artists. The review team would like to stress that wherever possible input from a range of practices from local, national and international artist/designers would further enhance the scope of content and delivery. It was also noted that where possible specialised workshops and seminars that examine the latest developments in teaching and learning methods would further benefit staff development.

The teaching staff are all specialists in the study subjects they deliver and are acknowledged artists. The review team think that staff are well qualified to deliver the learning outcomes. As previously commented (2013 external review) the review team acknowledges that the staff/student ratio is very positive in comparison to comparable national and international European higher arts education institutions as reflected in all aspects of their review process.

An area of future development that the review team identified was how increasing input from national and international artist/designers would ensure continual growth, subject knowledge development and curriculum progression in keeping with national and international MA benchmarks.

Staff have been recruited in line with national guidelines; the staff are all specialists in their fields and are adequately qualified to teach their specialisms. Since 2010 the number of staff has declined

from 20 to 9. Only 1 staff member is under 35, 1 under 50 and 7 over 50. While the experience of the older staff is commendable, the introduction of digital subjects and the investment in new technologies (hardware and software) necessitates the introduction of staff who are fully up to speed with these rapidly changing technologies. The review team recommend that this is addressed in an on-going annual review process to ensure all aims, LO's and curriculum design and content, teaching methods, the latest developments in learning and teaching at Higher Education level, with more focus on student centred learning and critical knowledge continues to grow.

The University does support the professional development of the teaching staff mainly through national and international exchange visits, conferences/seminars and exhibitions. There are substantial lists of academic and artistic activities outlined in both SER. P. 18 and in the individual staff C.Vs contained in Annex 4. These lists outline the activities of the teaching staff at national and international levels (during the study period 65 staff travelled abroad, to engage in staff development activities). This appears to sufficiently address the recommendation in the previous review (recommendation 9) to encourage greater participation by staff in international activities. These activities include:

- Training workshops, both regionally and in Vilnius
- Teacher involvement in admission and examination procedures in other Lithuanian HEIs
- Faculty exchanges to other European countries such as Latvia, Hungary Portugal and Czech Republic.

There is also an extensive list of research dissemination by staff both in terms of artistic exhibitions and academic publications (SER. P 19-21).

As the ongoing development of any programme is greatly enhanced by continuous interaction between staff and their international peers it is important that the HEI continues to support international activities and continues to implement the policies, which it put in place since the last review. Participation in international conferences, which was less evident in the documents should also be encouraged as these are the forums in which contemporary issues, relating to the field are discussed and developed. The review team regards this as essential and necessary on-going support to be offered from the university. The university has established regulations and financial resources on the staff's development and the direct implementation of these norms are part of the duties of the Head of Department. The regulations oblige the staff members to improve their research, academic and professional qualifications at least once in 5year period, which is also teacher's election period. The Team considers this as a minimum of the necessary qualification improvement activities and active managerial support from the university would be highly welcome. During the site visit

review team learned that the graduates and students support the necessity to involve incoming professionals and/or teachers from Lithuanian HEI and abroad in the process of studies.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The review team were able to conclude in a very consistent way to the MA programme at SU from all presented information in the SER and during the site visit that the premises for studies are adequate to the needs of programme. Study premises allocated for MA studies comprises of 766m² space. This seems suitable for the average number of 20 students studying in the Programme. Studio spaces are distributed in accordance with the MA specialism directions: Painting (3 rooms, 141m²), Graphic arts (2 rooms, 103m²) and Design (3 rooms, 105m²). The studios are adequately equipped and can provide necessary environment for creative endeavours of the MA students. Separate classroom is allocated for theory studies and it is a part of the 330m² space of a common use of Fine Art studies. The University art gallery (175m²) also is a space which is shared by all students of the Fine Art programmes. Whilst additions are always valuable the suitability and accessibility to learning materials seems at present to be adequate to meet the needs of the MA programme students. The review team wishes to add that regular reviews of health and safety requirements in all facilities are kept up to date, relevant and where appropriate facilities receive the necessary financial investments from the university to up grade the provision. The review team would welcome on-going review of how student accessibility to the department's resources continues to be expanded to meet student creative activity and independent learning. The review team acknowledges that improvements with new resources, practical and theoretical, have lead to more transparent and experimental practices evidenced in the programme. The review team recommend that the programme continues to address how appropriate other mediums and practices can be integrated to continue to raise the profile and uniqueness of the programme and increase the employability of the students.

The Art Faculty has fully equipped *K. Kizevičius Graphics Centre* at its disposal with the total area of 103m² which can accommodate activities of 20 persons. There are available etching presses, silk-screen printing machine, expositional cameras for preparation of forms, hothouses, a fume hood for etching chemical process, a camera for washing silk-screen printings, offset printing equipment. (SER p.22) The University has implemented the project *Modernization of infrastructure and basic equipment of the areas of humanities, social sciences, and arts at ŠU seeking to increase the efficiency and internationalization of the study process* which provided the opportunities to purchase the studio and laboratory equipment – the study environment was equipped with multiple

technological unites for visualization, lighting purposes as well as interactive communication (p.22-23). The review team also believes that consistent with the previous review 2013 that the size of premises for studies are adequate and commends the University for the new development of the study premises, computer suites and the new digital photo/video and sound workshops. The review team strongly recommends that a full Health & Safety risk assessment of the workshops, which if left some will present health hazards to students and staff.

As previously noted the University library is excellent and offers appropriate services to Master's level students. The premises are equipped with multimedia projectors, computers, magnetic white boards and the entire library has wireless internet access, crèche, teaching/seminar spaces and lecture theatre. The library enables disability access. The review team would welcome continual review of periodicals and art and design databases to ensure the most up to date and relevant resources are available to meet the needs of the programme.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

Compared to the entrance procedures for the BA Fine Arts programme, the requirements for the MA Fine Arts leave the HEI more autonomy in choosing between applicants. The students are assessed on the basis of the average marks of their previous degree, a collection of previous works (portfolio), motivation letters and a personal interview. The SER also informs that students with a different educational background (designers, media artists, teachers, architects) can be accepted in the Programme but in some cases 'bridging courses' may be required for the applicants to reach the level of competences necessary for the MA degree studies - this is more open approach to the admission of graduate studies which was suggested by the external review in 2013 (recommendation 12). An Admission Commission evaluates the prospective candidates; decisions have to be approved by the dean (SER, p.24). The review team finds these forms of assessment appropriate. The review team would advise the HEI to allow members of the Students' Representative Office to be present during the interview procedure to guarantee transparency. It would also recommend that students who were not granted admission receive constructive feedback after the procedure (please refer to Recommendations 6 and 7).

Over the course of the study (2012-2016) there has been a steady decline in the numbers of students accepted on to the programme. Over this period 74 students have been admitted to the programme, however annual numbers have decreased from 22 in 2012 to 9 in 2016 (SER. p 36-37). This is part a result of a national revision of state funding to 2nd cycle programmes; no new entrants have received state funding since 2013.

The percentage of student drop outs has improved considerably over the same period from 14.6% in 2012/13 to 4.2% in 2015/16, with 0% during the Autumn period of 2016/17 (SER. p 29-30).

Annex 1 of the SER states that the MA course lasts three semesters, each containing 30 ECTS-Credits. The first two semesters contain subjects in art theory and various art projects and technical specialisations. The third semester is reserved for the final Master Thesis (30 ECTS-Credits). The SER states that the content of the curriculum is structured into four subject groups: artistic project activities, artistic research activities, integral art activities, and activities of personal and professional development (p.12). The course descriptions provided in Annex 2 of the SER explain how each subject is contributing to achieving the course's intended learning outcomes; an overview of the relations of subjects and learning outcomes is also provided in Annex 8. The review team came to the conclusion that the organisation of the study process ensures a proper implementation of the programme and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

During the site visit the review team was able to confirm with social partners and graduates that students as well as graduates play an active role in the local community. The HEI owns a generous exhibition space which is ideal for students' needs and open to the public almost every day. The review team considers this an important investment into the artistic activities of its students.

Student research and artistic activities are practiced in a number of forms and are outlined in the SER, p 25. Student are made aware of possible participation in research activities through the SU website, social sites of the Department, SU information stands and the university newspaper. To date these research activities, include:

- Exhibitions of student work in public venues, such as hospitals libraries and schools,
- Working with social partners in areas such as design projects and exhibition organisation
- Taking part in national exhibitions of student work, curated by teaching staff
- Taking part in joint teacher/student creative projects, which is an initiative recently adopted by the Department

The review team was able to visit an exhibition of final Master pieces that were displayed together with the written academic thesis. The members of the review team appreciated the good standard of academic writing.

The SER admits that the HEI would like students' mobility to be higher. During the period of evaluation, only two students have used the opportunity of studying abroad. The HEI believes that the short duration of the programme as well as the small financial funds of students could be reasons for this lack of mobility. It also states that many students need to work in order to sustain themselves (SER, p. 28). This was also confirmed by students during the site visit.

The review team thinks that these reasons justify the relatively low student mobility. It is notable that the HEI makes a successful effort to encourage staff mobility as a means of balancing the low

students' mobility (SER, p. 17-18). However, the review team would advise not to include members of evaluation panels in this list, as this information is confusing: there is a distinct difference between teaching at a HEI and assessing it.

The intimate community of students and staff at the department left the review team with the impression that students are provided with the appropriate amount of personal academic support. Many MA students at the department stated the good relationship with the teaching staff of the BA programme as their main reason to continue their studies at the same HEI.

The social support provided by the HEI seems to be adequate; a limited number of state-funded scholarships is available. It is notable that students can leave their child at a kindergarten for several hours when visiting the library. Students have confirmed that in the case of a personal or social crisis, they are able to find appropriate counselling offers inside and outside of the HEI.

The HEI is publishing detailed course descriptions for each study subject (Annex 2 of the SER). They clearly outline assessment criteria, explain cumulative grading procedures and refer to the respective intended learning outcomes of the programme. According to students, the course descriptions are published on the HEI's online academic platform and explained to students during the first sessions in the beginning of the semester. The defence of the Master thesis consists of three stages that are graded separately: a defence of the written theoretical text in front of a defence commission (chaired by a professor from a different HEI), a defence on front of the department staff, and a defence at the public art gallery. From these three assessments, the defence commission calculates a final grade. The review team considers the assessment of student achievement to be clear, public and appropriate to assess the learning outcomes.

The SER presents data collected by the HEI on the graduates' employment situation; it shows that the majority of students have found employment in art-related fields. ŠU has its own *Career Centre* which realizes surveys and analysis of the information about the employability issues. Data from *Lithuanian Labour Market* sources are used as well as the information received by interviewing graduates and social partners. The data on employability are partially collected during the admission and therefore are influenced by the students' previous education – a part of graduates had completed the programme *Fine Arts and Design* before they entered the MA programme; there are also graduates working as teachers of art in gymnasiums and schools of arts. Graduates work as artists and designers and a great part of them are “engaged in individual creative activities, participate in exhibitions, art projects, are members of *Lithuanian Artists' Association*”. (SER p.31) However, as clarified to the review team during the site visit, since a good amount of students leave the country or work as freelance artists they are not represented in this research. The informative

value of the data therefore remains limited. During the conversation with graduates and social partners, the review team was able to witness a general confidence concerning the employability of graduates. In order to increase graduates' abilities to connect to an international as well as a local context, the review team would recommend the inclusion of wider socio-cultural contexts into all aspects of curriculum design, content and delivery (please refer to Recommendation 1).

When talking to students, staff, graduates and social partners, the review team was able to convince itself that the art department and its graduates play an important part in creating a local art and design scene. Social partners are regularly contacting the department and asking for contributions to local projects in the field of interior and urban design. The review team was able to visit a public exhibition of some students' local project proposals; such public displays guarantee that the results of academic projects are being re-fed to the local community in a purposeful manner. The review team considers it important that local art scenes are promoted and feels that the University and the Art Faculty in particular plays a key role in ensuring this in Šiauliai – especially since the issue of continuing emigration was brought up by staff on several occasions. The bond to the local social fabric could be further developed by integrating wider socio-cultural contexts into all aspects of curriculum design, content and delivery (please refer to Recommendation 1).

The SER refers to several documents that define the academic standards and codes of conduct at the HEI: the “*Regulation of Studies*” provide the HEIs legal framework on all matters related to examinations; the “*Students' Code of Ethics*” published by the Students' Representative Office of the HEI provides guidelines that also include the use of proper academic standards.

However, fair learning environment is not just ensured by implementing academic standards but also by granting equal opportunities to students of all genders, ages, financial means, ethnic backgrounds, sexual orientations etc. Since the SER does not address the any issues of possible discrimination, the review team feels that awareness of various societal exclusion mechanisms could be further enhanced. Although the HEI management stated during the site visit that there were no reported complaints of discrimination, the review team would advise the HEI and the department to encourage sensitivity amongst all stakeholders towards issues relating discrimination (please refer to Recommendation 5).

During the site visit, staff and students confirmed that disputes are usually resolved through constructive dialogue rather than official complaints procedures; should discussions not provide solutions, the HEI has regulated procedures for complaints and appeals in several documents referred to in the SER (p.27-28). Students are also represented in the various committees of the

HEI's academic self-government. According to the SER, there are no records of official complaints since the last evaluation.

The information gained by the review team during the interview sessions generally supports the HEIs notion that conflicts can be resolved on a personal basis: the familiar atmosphere at the department and the high satisfaction of students with their teachers seems to create a climate in which conflicts can be resolved efficiently through a personal discussion. However, the review team believes that in some cases an intimate atmosphere could also pose an obstacle for efficient complaints procedures. During interview sessions with students, it became evident that the Students' Representative Office seems not to play a very important role in their day-to-day student life. Students of the department seem to be mostly unaware that they have representatives in the HEI's committees or the SER group. The review team would advise that the HEI and the department improve the integration of the students' voice better into the processes of academic self-government (please refer to Recommendation 5, 6 and 7).

2.6. Programme management

The review team was provided with evidence in the SER and annex documents how the new Quality Assurance process of gathering data is implemented and reviewed. Quality of studies of the programme is ensured by the University internal quality assurance management system. The review team recognises a need to articulate a clearer alignment and management overview of the 2 cycles of study BA and MA together, in relation to content, staged learning progression, a variety of informed contexts of contemporary critical practice and subject knowledge requirements across and distinct between the 2 study cycles. There is reference in the SER. p 25 of a number of non-formal competencies acquired by students, through their external activities and their interaction with the social partners; these positive interactions were also acknowledged by the students and the social partners. The SER. p 25 states that these activities are evaluated during reviews however there is no evidence of a formal structure for doing this. In the interest of clarity and fairness the review team would welcome more formal recognition of these activities. The review team would also welcome further articulation and where appropriate clarity on how a more integrated (BA/MA, cycle 1, 2) is evidenced across all aspects of the critical learning environment.

During the site visit, staff and students confirmed that disputes are usually resolved through constructive dialogue rather than official complaints procedures; should discussions not provide solutions, the HEI has regulated procedures for complaints and appeals in several documents referred to in the SER (p.27-28). Students are also represented in the various committees of the

HEI's academic self-government. According to the SER, there are no records of official complaints since the last evaluation.

During the site visit, meetings with both staff and students confirmed the informal nature of how complaints and suggestions are made. On one level the good teacher/student relationship is to be commended, however it is important that formal procedures are in place to insure transparency, fairness and inclusivity in the decision-making process. HEI has regulated procedures for complaints and appeals in several documents referred to in the SER (p.27-28). Students are also represented in the various committees, however there have been no student complaints lodged through these procedures in recent years, despite the fact that students have issues which they wish to have resolved, such as the length of opening hours and access to the studios and facilities. This seems to indicate that a more integrated approach is required where students feel that they are more integrated into the decision-making process. Therefore the review team strongly recommends that the student's integrated role in any future reviews and planning needs to be more clearly defined and implemented and that the review team recommends that the faculty/department ensure collegiate participation in all academic discussions to guarantee that all voices are heard. The review team feel that this would ensure that any future SER will do the program justice and reflect the obvious rich and dynamic nature of the programme. This should be considered for the production of future documents, and where appropriate, training should be encouraged. The review team would encourage the programme to build on the evident good developmental practice to create better understanding of the value, purpose, authorship and translation of self-evaluation documents as a tool for both programme development and accreditation processes. This would further ensure the programme carries out a more systematic self-evaluation through closer consideration of its strengths (including distinctive features), weaknesses, opportunities and threats as noted in the 2013 review.

The review team would welcome clear articulation of how the programme continues to build and manage international contacts and develops exchange programmes. The review team fully endorses that the staff continues to look closely at the work of some of their higher arts education national and international competitors to ensure relevance, management, vitality and creative ambition. As previously recommended the review team would also like to endorse that a peer from another Higher Arts Education institution (preferably one that the programme respects for their quality) should be invited on to the *Group for Monitoring of Quality of Fine Art Study Programme* committee. Annex 7 suggests that in response to this previous recommendation that the programme team would formalise their knowledge of social partners, through the creation of databases this

displays a certain lack of understanding in relation to the content of the recommendation. It is evident from the SER. p 19 that there has been a number of visiting academics over the review period 2012-2016 (45 visitors in total), however, the suggestion of recruiting a staff member from another comparable HEI to participate on a Quality Monitoring group has not yet been fully realised.

The summary of the previous report (section 6 Programme Management) refers to a number of ways in which the internal quality assurance policy and process could be improved. They included areas such as data collection on both students and teachers, recording of achievements and mobility activities, the involvement of students and stakeholders and a development of students' theoretical skills. There have been improvements made in all of these areas, in particular the collation of statistical data and the involvement of stakeholders.

The review team would like to encourage continued development in these areas, in particular greater participation of the students in the decision-making process; an aspiration that is now enshrined in the current edition of the European Standards and Guidelines (http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf) To this end the review team would also encourage the programme team to continue to carry out systematic self-evaluation through closer consideration of its strengths (including distinctive features), weaknesses, opportunities and potential threats – in particular recruitment. The internal quality assurance policy in particular staff, employers, partners and student voices need to be better embedded in the Faculty and programme review process.

Of particular note the review team would like to point out how at SU, the SER and site visit confirm that the programme delivers a sound understanding of how the outcomes of the study and practice of art and design in higher education contribute to the cultural development and the economic well-being of the individual and of society. In both cases, an understanding of the context of the varied practices are being integrated through professional development/studies/placements - that meet the needs, demands and contexts locally, nationally and internationally within the subject field of Fine Arts.

Since the previous review there has been a greater integration of social partners into the activities of the programme. Social partners are now engaged in:

- developing topics for final projects, this is evidenced in some examples of projects outlined in SER. P 31 which related to local public and private sectoral issues.
- Delivering practical sessions
- Employing graduates

- Involvement in assessing the preparedness of graduates and offering suggestions for improvement. (SER. P 36).

Key stakeholders are involved in the QA process, however the review team think this could be better embedded, following the review teams discussions on the site visit, in future review process's as a more active part of the process. There are records for student recruitment, profile, progression, retention, achievement, mobility, scholarship and employment as well as teaching staff profile, qualifications, research, and recruitment data. Stakeholders are highly motivated.

There were important structural transformations at the SU in 2016. The review team was able to establish a clear understanding of the structural changes, rationale and their implications during the site visit. The changes also meet the recommendations from the previous review in both the institutional changes and programme descriptions.

The review team also was able to confirm that the management structures are effective in order to maintain the necessary short and long-term aims. In 2014, *Further Activities Development Plan for 2014-2016* was made (see Annex 7). The plan is reviewed annually and supplemented with regard to the achieved outcomes. The Rector established the SER preparatory group in September 29, 2016; its composition was made by the Department of Arts in June 16, 2016.

The review team felt very confident all information about the study programme was made available to the public in all the appropriate and relevant forms. Information is made available online through AIKOS, on the website of the Association of Lithuanian Higher Schools for Common Admission, the University website and the Faculty website. Information literature is also distributed locally and regionally at study fairs.

2.7. Examples of excellence

Consistent with the experts' team review of the MA programme at SU it was acknowledged that this programme produces committed and highly motivated creative practitioners in wide range of individually negotiated practices. There is a real sense of creative community established through the student and staff learning environment. That the particular content of the programme meets both local and national needs along with the characteristics of the resources. These students achieve their study aims in a highly inclusive and supportive creative environment, this is a point highlighted by the members of the employers and graduates group.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Teaching staff should continue to work closely with the students to help them fully understand the function and value of learning outcomes in the learning process, in particular how this supports independent, self-negotiated learning.
2. The review team would recommend a reconsideration of the programme title. Currently the use of the term Fine Arts, Arts' is seen in relation to national and international benchmarks for 'Fine Art' study as distinct from the American term 'Fine Arts' that includes design, to avoid long term confusion with prospective students, the academic field and employers, the programme team should consider a title that removes all ambiguity and clarifies the programme's context.
3. The programme should continue to review the theoretical content and its integration within all aspects of the programme, the review team recommends that there is engagement with wider socio-cultural contexts in all aspects of curriculum design, content and delivery.
4. Where appropriate increase the teaching/practical/theoretical input from national and international visiting artists, designers or researchers.
5. Staff development activities should be embedded into the programme that examines the latest developments in learning and teaching.
6. A full health & safety risk assessment of the workshops is recommended, to insure a safe working environment for both students and staff. If left unchecked the current arrangement could prove a substantial risk.
7. The review team recommend that opportunities for wider participation to the Programme be explored. The HEI should explore how processes for accrediting prior learning and prior experiential learning might be implemented to broaden the student demographic.
8. The review team recommends that student accessibility to the department's resources continue to be expanded to meet student creative activity and independent learning.
9. The programme would benefit from the introduction of a positive culture of critical discourse of the individuals' relationship to others (ethical studies).
10. Strengthen the distinctiveness and clarity between MA and BA cycles in order to set out and provide the appropriate staged learning progression for the 2 cycles of study, in particular transparency for the students in how the intellectual and practical developments are integrated from Bachelor to Master's level.
11. The review team strongly recommends that the student's integrated role in any future reviews and planning needs to be more clearly defined and implemented.
12. The review team recommends that the faculty/department ensures collegiate participation in all academic discussions to guarantee that all voices are heard.

13. The review team does not feel that the SER does the program justice and reflect the obvious rich and dynamic nature of the programme. This should be considered for the production of future documents, and where appropriate, training should be encouraged.

IV. SUMMARY

The review team would welcome on-going review processes to address both national and international developments in understanding, employability and recognition in the shifting field of contemporary creative practices and how this can be reflected in the future programme aims and learning outcomes. The review team think it is important to stress that the international benchmark for Fine Art as distinct from the American term Fine Arts – including design – is described as addressing practical and theoretical concerns through a broad spectrum of two-dimensional, three-dimensional and time-based media, materials and processes. In particular the integration between theory and practice to develop self negotiated independent learning at MA level. As highlighted in the previous evaluation (2013) the review team are not convinced the name of the programme and the qualification offered are compatible with each other and would welcome clarification across all programme documents.

It is the view of the review team that as they stand the aims and learning outcomes are well defined, and the objectives articulate well to local and national needs, within the stated educational sectors. The objectives also correspond with the Faculty values expressed in the SER and its commitment to provide the most appropriate education for creative practitioners across a broad spectrum. It was very evident to the review team that the Faculty's social partners, students and graduates were extremely positive in their praise for the learning outcomes, the inclusive learning environment and how the programme structure articulates learning. There was considerable development by the University, following the recommendation of the last 'Expert Reviews' 2010 and 2013, and this is reflected in clearer and more concise aims and learning outcomes that now consistently meet professional requirements and are fully supported and endorsed by the review team.

The review team would welcome further future development between theory and practice and how this can be more fully integrated into all studio and theory modules. In particular the review team recognises a need to continue to develop independent critical learners to meet the needs of graduation learning at MA level with the ability to develop students ability to be self-critical and articulate their own learning, critical position, research skills and contextual awareness through verbal and written means. The review team supports the intention for the research content and breadth of inquiry content in written dissertations to be more consistently integrated. All aspects of the curriculum appear to be designed in accordance with legislative requirements and comply with national regulations. The review team were able to reflect on the multiplicity and potential interdisciplinary nature of the programme that meet good standards and would welcome consistent on-going review at the local level of the specific disciplines, thus allowing providers to update and

innovate in terms of programme design, content, learning and assessment.

The Programme rightly states and emphasises imagination and creativity in its holistic learning, aligned to self negotiated independent learning. The review team wants to ensure that this is continually factored and designed into the curriculum to develop students' intellectual powers, entrepreneurial capabilities and their ability to communicate a rigour in process and thought in the acquisition of independent judgment and critical self-awareness. The review team want to safeguard that this can continue to generate a positive, inclusive educational culture where students are able to articulate how this enhances their critical awareness by locating the individual in relation to both contemporary and historical contexts, thus enhancing originality and personal expression. The review team recommend that the programmes needs be focused here in order to be able to be reflexive and responsive to how students also understand the broad vocational, economic, social and environmental contexts of their study and the range of professional opportunities available to them. This would include the students' broader understanding of global contexts developed through a programme that embraces international cultural, economic and environmental perspectives. Traditionally introduced through study visits, student exchange and placement, this could be further supplemented by increasing numbers of international partnerships, staff exchanges and international students.

The staffing meets the legal requirements – it consists of specialists in the study subjects they deliver and are acknowledged artists. The staff/student ratio is very positive. The core teaching staff are highly thought of and praised by the students, employers and alumni. The University does support the professional development of the teaching staff and is providing appropriate time for the staff to carry out research the review team whole heartedly support the continual growth of this by the University. This would include approaches to learning, subject knowledge and professional development in response to the increased levels of participation in higher education in Europe, and to developments in teaching, learning and assessment in higher education. Participation in exchange programmes, seminars and professional artistic development support are examples the review team think would be extremely beneficial. The review team also concluded that there would be increased benefit across all aspects of the programme from increased teaching input from national and international artist/designers.

The review team observed that the facilities were consistent with those outlined in the SER and these spaces appear adequate to achieve the learning outcomes. The review team wishes to add that regular reviews of health and safety requirements in all facilities are kept up to date, relevant and where appropriate facilities receive the necessary financial investments from the university to up

grade the provision. The review team's visit affirmed the SER's description of the library facilities as an excellent resource and provision and offers appropriate services to Master's level students.

One challenge the review team identified was how new approaches to learning with increasing numbers of students working in environments that potentially require support by a wide range of technical workshops in particular IT and other specialist facilities. This is identified in response to the developments that have been driven by the changing nature of the disciplines and new technologies that are creating alternative synergies and modes of practice.

Recent up dates and new provision has been an acknowledged development in the study premises and across the programme resources, and in particular the review team welcomed the addition and the establishment of the new University gallery.

The review team welcomes the transformations the Art Faculty has made to the MA Fine Arts programmes admission procedure to engage with a potentially wider diversity of learners. As was consistent with the SU BA programme the review team acknowledges that teaching staff will need to work closely with the students to help them fully understand the function and value of learning outcomes in the learning process, in particular the element of independent learning. The review team felt discussion and possible introduction of student's own tutorial records and/or written self-evaluation reports throughout their study would aid and ensure independent learning. The review team felt it was important to maintain and develop methods of learning to aid students to articulate and synthesise their knowledge and understanding in both written and verbal forms. The review team also wished to highlight the need to integrate how the programme address the need for students to produce their work more mindful of an audience, a user or a professional need. Such personal and professional development is generally expressed in a range of forms including reflective journals, blogs and personal development records.

Assessment procedures are outlined in the SER and the cumulative process described appears to be appropriate to the subject areas. The Academic Code of Ethics provides for an assessment system that is fair and unbiased. However, fair learning environment is not just ensured by implementing academic standards but also by granting equal opportunities to students of all genders, ages, financial means, ethnic backgrounds, sexual orientations etc. Since the SER does not address issues of possible discrimination, the review team feels that awareness of various societal exclusion mechanisms could be further enhanced. Students indicated to the review team that in the area of receiving academic advice was being adequately met through online resources and personal consultations. On personal matters the review team would like to see the HEI in exploring various avenues of providing financial, learning and counselling support to students, particularly those experiencing financial difficulties.

It was acknowledged by the review team that there were important structural transformations at the SU in 2016. The review team was able to establish a clear understanding of the structural changes, rationale and their implications during the site visit. The changes also meet the recommendations from the previous review in both the institutional changes and programme descriptions. The review team also was able to confirm that the management structures are clear and effective in order to maintain the necessary short and long-term aims.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Fine Arts* (state code – 621W10012) at Šiauliai 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	18

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Atis Kampars
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Michael Fox
	Duncan Higgins
	Saulius Valius
	Anna Lena Bankel

**ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *DAILĖ*
(VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621W10012) 2017-05-17 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ
NR. SV4-90 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Šiaulių universiteto studijų programa *Dailė* (valstybinis kodas – 621W10012) vertinama **teigiamai**.

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

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

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

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

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Vertinimo grupė palankiai vertintų, jeigu vertinimo procesai vyktų nuolat siekiant iširti nacionalinius ir tarptautinius pokyčius, susijusius su supratimu, panaudojamumu ir pripažinimu kintančioje šiuolaikinės kūrybinės praktikos srityje, ir tai, kaip šie pokyčiai galėtų atsispindėti būsimuose programos tiksluose ir studijų rezultatuose. Vertinimo grupė nuomone, svarbu pabrėžti, kad pagal tarptautinį lyginamąjį standartą vaizduojamasis menas, kuris skiriasi nuo amerikietiško termino „dailė“, apimančio ir dizainą, yra apibūdinamas kaip praktinių ir teorinių klausimų sprendimas panaudojant plataus spektro dvimates, trimates ir laiku grindžiamas medijas, medžiagas ir procesus. Visų pirma reikia integruoti teoriją ir praktiką, kad būtų sudarytos sąlygos magistrantūros studijų pakopoje mokytis savarankiškai pagal nustatytą planą. Kaip pažymėta atliekant ankstesnį vertinimą (2013 m.), vertinimo grupės neįtikina tai, kad programos pavadinimas atitinka siūlomą kvalifikaciją, todėl ji rekomenduoja šį aspektą patikslinti visuose programos dokumentuose.

Vertinimo grupė mano, kad patys studijų tikslai ir rezultatai yra gerai apibrėžti, o tikslai nurodytuose švietimo sektoriuose atitinka vietas ir nacionalinius poreikius. Tikslai taip pat atitinka savianalizės suvestinėje nurodytas fakulteto vertybes bei išipareigojimą užtikrinti tinkamiausią plataus spektro kūrybinių praktikų švietimą. Vertinimo grupei labai akivaizdu, kad fakulteto socialiniai partneriai, studentai ir absolventai labai teigiamai vertina studijų rezultatus, integracinę mokymosi aplinką ir tai, kaip programos struktūra atspindi studijų procesą. Remiantis paskutinių 2010 ir 2013 m. ekspertinių vertinimų rekomendacijomis, universitetas padarė didelę pažangą; tai rodo ir aiškiau bei glausčiau apibūdinti studijų tikslai ir rezultatai, kurie dabar visiškai atitinka profesinius reikalavimus ir kuriuos palaiko ir remia vertinimo grupė.

Vertinimo grupė palankiai vertintų, jeigu ateityje teorija ir praktika būtų plėtojamos kartu ir labiau integruojamos visuose darbo studijoje ir teoriniuose moduluose. Visų pirma vertinimo grupė pripažįsta, kad yra būtina ugdyti savarankiškus kritiškus studentus ir patenkinti magistrantūros studijų poreikius užsitikrinant galimybę ugdyti studentų gebėjimą būti savikritišku, tinkamiausiu būdu žodžiu ir raštu suformuluoti ir pristatyti savo pačių kritinę nuomonę mokymosi klausimu, įgūdžius mokslinių tyrimų srityje ir konteksto supratimą. Vertinimo grupė palaiko ketinimą nuosekliau integruoti į disertacijas mokslinių tyrimų ir ankstesnių darbų analizės turinį. Studijų turinys yra parengtas remiantis teisės aktų reikalavimais ir atitinka nacionalinius teisės aktus. Vertinimo grupė išnagrinėjo įvairialypį ir galimai tarpdisciplininį programos pobūdį, kuris atitinka gerus standartus, todėl palankiai vertintų, jeigu konkrečių dalykų lygmeniu būtų nuolat atliekamas vertinimas ir sudarytos sąlygos programos vykdytojams atnaujinti programos sandarą, turinį, mokymosi ir vertinimo procesus ir diegti naujoves.

Programoje teisingai nurodo ir akcentuoja, kad vaizduotė ir kūrybingumas holistiniame mokymesi yra derinami su savarankišku mokymusi pagal nustatytą planą. Vertinimo grupė nori užtikrinti, kad šis aspektas būtų nuolat įtraukiamas į studijų turinį, kad būtų ugdomi studentų intelektualiniai gebėjimai, verslumo įgūdžiai, gebėjimas pademonstruoti kruopštumą ir tiksliai perteikti mintis, mokantis savarankiškai priimti sprendimus ir įgyjant kritinės savivokos. Vertinimo grupė nori šiuo požiūriu užtikrinti tęstinumą siekiant teigiamos ir integracinės švietimo kultūros, kurioje studentai galėtų aiškiai nurodyti, kaip kritinio sąmoningumo ugdymas ir šiuolaikinės bei istorinės aplinkos supratimas padeda stiprinti jų intelektualinius gebėjimus, originalumą ir saviraišką. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja programose dėmesį skirti šiam aspektui, kad būtų galima apsvarstyti ir reaguoti į tai, kaip studentai supranta studijų platųjį profesinio rengimo, ekonominį, socialinį ir aplinkos kontekstą ir įvairias atsiveriančias profesines galimybes. Tai apimtų platesnį studentų supratimą apie pasaulinį kontekstą, kurį jie įgytų studijuodami pagal programą, grindžiamą tarptautinėmis kultūros, ekonomikos ir aplinkos perspektyvomis. Tradiciškai plėtojamas organizuojant mokomuosius

vizitus, studentų mainus ir stažuotes, šis aspektas gali būti papildomas didinant tarptautinių partnerysčių, darbuotojų mainų mastą ir užsienio studentų skaičių.

Darbuotojai tenkina teisinius reikalavimus: dalykus dėsto savo srities specialistai ir pripažinti menininkai. Dėstytojų ir studentų santykis yra labai geras. Pagrindinius dėstytojus labai gerai vertina ir giria studentai, darbdaviai ir absolventai. Universitetas remia dėstytojų profesinį tobulėjimą ir sudaro sąlygas laiku atlikti mokslinius tyrimus; vertinimo grupė nuoširdžiai palaiko universitetą, kad jis ir toliau plėtotų šią veiklą. Tai būtų skatinimas taikyti metodus, susijusius su mokymusi, dalyko žiniomis ir profesiniu tobulėjimu, atsižvelgiant į didesnę aktyvumą Europos aukštojo mokslo srityje, taip pat į pokyčius mokymo aukštosiose mokyklose, studijų ir vertinimo srityse. Dalyvavimas mainų programose, seminaruose ir profesinį kūrybinį tobulinimąsi skatinančioje veikloje yra taip pat pavyzdys to, kas, vertinimo grupės nuomone, būtų naudinga universitetui. Vertinimo grupė taip pat nustatė, kad programai būtų visais aspektais naudinga, jeigu dalykus daugiau dėstytu šalies ir užsienio menininkai ir dizaineriai.

Vertinimo grupė atkreipė dėmesį į tai, kad patalpos atitinka aprašymus, pateiktus savianalizės suvestinėje, šios erdvės yra tinkamos studijų rezultatams pasiekti. Vertinimo grupė norėtų pridurti, kad visų patalpų atitiktis darbuotojų sveikatos ir saugos reikalavimams yra reguliariai tikrinama ir užtikrinama, prireikus universitetas skiria patalpoms atnaujinti reikalingas lėšas. Vertinimo grupės vizito metu nustatyta, bibliotekos patalpos, kaip aprašyta savianalizės suvestinėje, iš tiesų yra puikus studijų išteklius, ji yra gerai aprūpinta ir siūlo tinkamas paslaugas magistrantūros studentams. Viena iš vertinimo grupės nustatytų problemų yra klausimas, kaip sukurti naujus mokymosi metodus, kai vis daugiau studentų dirba aplinkoje, kurioje galimai reikalingos įvairiausios techninės dirbtuvės, visų pirma IT ir kita specializuota materialioji bazė. Ši problema nustatyta analizuojant pokyčius, atsiradusius dėl kintančio dalykų pobūdžio ir naujų technologijų, kuriančių alternatyvias sinergijas ir praktikos formas. Patvirtinta, kad neseniai atnaujintos studijoms skirtos patalpos, papildyti programos ištekliai; visų pirma vertinimo grupė palankiai įvertino naujai įkurtą universiteto galeriją.

Vertinimo grupė palaiko Menų fakulteto inicijuotus priėmimo į dailės programų magistrantūros studijas procedūrą pokyčius, kuriais siekiama didesnės studentų įvairovės. Kaip ir ŠU bakalauro studijų atveju, vertinimo grupė patvirtina, kad dėstytojai turės glaudžiai bendradarbiauti su studentais, kad padėtų jiems studijų procese visiškai perprasti studijų rezultatų, ypač savarankiško mokymosi dalies, funkciją ir vertę. Vertinimo grupė mano, kad plėtojant diskusiją ir galbūt studijų procese panaudojant pačių studentų mokomuosius užrašus ir (arba) rašytines įsivertinimo ataskaitas būtų galima suteikti pagalbą ir užtikrinti savarankišką mokymąsi. Vertinimo grupė mano, kad

svarbu taikyti ir kurti mokymosi metodus, kurie padėtų studentams raštu ir žodžiu aiškiai reikšti mintis bei sintetinti žinias ir supratimą. Vertinimo grupė taip pat norėtų pabrėžti, kad į programą reikia integruoti būdus, kaip padėti studentams kurti darbus labiau atsižvelgiant į auditoriją, vartotoją ar profesinius poreikius. Toks asmeninis ir profesinis tobulėjimas paprastai išreiškiamas įvairiomis formomis, įskaitant žurnalus, internetinius dienoraščius ir asmens tobulėjimą fiksuojančius užrašus.

Vertinimo procedūros nurodytos savianalizės suvestinėje, o joje aprašytas balų kaupimo procesas atitinka dalyko sritis. Akademinės etikos kodekse numatyta vertinimo sistema yra sąžininga ir objektyvi. Tačiau sąžiningo mokymosi aplinka užtikrinama ne tik įgyvendinant akademinis standartus, bet ir suteikiant vienodas galimybes visiems studentams, neatsižvelgiant į jų lytį, amžių, finansinę padėtį, etninę kilmę, seksualinę orientaciją ir pan. Kadangi savianalizės suvestinėje neaptariami galimos diskriminacijos klausimai, vertinimo grupė mano, kad būtų galima labiau didinti informuotumą įvairių socialinės atskirties mechanizmų klausimais. Studentai vertinimo grupei nurodė, kad akademinės konsultacijos yra teikiamos tinkamai pasitelkiant interneto išteklius ir asmeninių konsultacijų metu. Sprendžiant asmeninius klausimus, vertinimo grupė pageidautų, kad aukštoji mokykla apsvarstytų įvairias finansinės ir konsultacinės pagalbos teikimo studentams, ypač patiriantiems finansinių sunkumų, galimybes.

Vertinimo grupė patvirtino, kad 2016 m. ŠU įvyko svarbūs struktūriniai pokyčiai. Vertinimo grupė vizito metu nustatė, kad struktūriniai, prasminiai pokyčiai ir jų pasekmės yra aiškiai suvokiami. Pokyčiai taip pat atitinka ankstesnio vertinimo rekomendacijas ir dėl institucinių pokyčių, ir dėl programos aprašų. Vertinimo grupė taip pat patvirtino, kad valdymo struktūros yra patikimos ir veiksmingos, o tai leidžia toliau siekti trumpalaikių ir ilgalaikių tikslų.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Dėstytojai ateityje turėtų nuolat glaudžiai bendradarbiauti su studentais, kad padėtų jiems studijų procese visiškai perprasti studijų rezultatų funkciją ir vertę, ypač tai, kaip jie padeda mokytis savarankiškai pagal nusistatytą planą.
2. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja persvarstyti studijų programos pavadinimą. Šiuo metu terminas „dailė“ pagal nacionalinius ir tarptautinius lyginamuosius dailės studijų standartus yra suprantamas skirtingai nuo amerikietiško termino „dailė“, kuris apima dizainą; taip būtų išvengta ilgalaikės painiavos tarp būsimų studentų, akademinėje bendruomenėje ir tarp

darbdavių – programos įgyvendintojai turėtų rasti nedviprasmišką pavadinimą, patikslinantį programos kontekstą.

3. Reikėtų peržiūrėti programos teorinį turinį ir tai, kaip jis integruotas visais programos aspektais – vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja visais programos sandaros, turinio ir vykdymo aspektais įtraukti platesnį socialinį ir kultūrinį kontekstą.
4. Kur tinkama, reikėtų skatinti atvykstančius šalies ir užsienio menininkus, dizainerius ar tyrėjus aktyviau dalyvauti praktinio ir teorinio mokymo veikloje.
5. Į programą turėtų būti įtraukta personalo kvalifikacijos kėlimo veikla, apimanti naujausius pokyčius mokymosi ir mokymo srityse.
6. Reikėtų atlikti visapusišką dirbtuvių sveikatos apsaugos ir saugos vertinimą ir užtikrinti studentams bei personalui saugią darbo aplinką. Nesiimant veiksmų, dėl esamos padėties gali kilti rimta rizika.
7. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja ištirti galimybes plačiau dalyvauti programoje. Aukštoji mokykla turėtų išnagrinėti, kaip įgyvendinti ankstesnių studijų ir patirtinio mokymosi akreditavimo procesus ir išplėsti studentų demografiją.
8. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja ir toliau plėsti studentams prieinamus katedros išteklius, atitinkančius studentų kūrybinės veiklos ir savarankiško mokymosi poreikius.
9. Programai būtų naudinga įdiegti pozityvią asmenų santykio su kitais individais kritinio diskurso kultūrą (etikos studijos).
10. Reikėtų labiau ir aiškiau atskirti magistrantūros bei bakalauro studijas ir taip nustatyti ir užtikrinti deramą lėšų mokymosi pažangą abejuose studijų pakopose, ypač suteikti studentams aiškumo, kaip intelektualiniai ir praktiniai įgūdžiai kinta po bakalauro studijų mokslus tęsiant magistrantūroje.
11. Vertinimo grupė labai rekomenduoja reikėtų aiškiau apibrėžti ir užtikrinti integruotą studentų vaidmenį būsimoje vertinimo ir planavimo veikloje.

12. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja fakultetui ir (arba) katedrai užtikrinti kolegialumą visose akademinėse diskusijose, kad būtų išgirsti visi balsai.
13. Vertinimo grupė nemano, kad savianalizės suvestinėje programa apibūdinta teisingai, nes nėra atskleistas akivaizdžiai įvairialypis ir dinamiškas programos pobūdis. Į tai reikėtų atsižvelgti ateityje rengiant dokumentus, taip pat, kur tinkama, paskatinti mokymą.

<...>

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)