



Quality Enhancement Review Report

Programme review

Fine Art - Creation in Public Space (BA and MA)

TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF LIBEREC



October 12 – 15 2019

Contents

Introduction	3
Review Team members	4
1. Programme’s goals and context	6
2. Educational processes	9
2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery	9
2.2 International perspectives.....	12
2.3 Assessment	13
3. Student profiles	16
3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications.....	16
3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability.....	17
4. Teaching staff	20
4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity	20
4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body	21
5. Facilities, resources and support.....	23
5.1 Facilities	23
5.2 Financial Resources.....	24
5.3 Support staff.....	24
6. Communication, organisation and decision-making	26
6.1 Internal communication process	26
6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes.....	27
7. Internal Quality Culture	28
8. Public interaction	30
8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts.....	30
8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions	30
8.3 Information provided to the public.....	31
9. Summary of the programme’s compliance with EQ-Arts Standards	34
10. Summary of strong points, recommendations and conditions	36
11. Conclusion.....	39
Annex 1 – List of supporting documents	40

Introduction

The EQ-Arts programme review of the newly proposed study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* was undertaken in terms of an enhancement review, based on the eight EQ-Arts Standards and sub-standards¹. EQ-Arts was invited by the Technical University Liberec (TUL) to review this new study programmes *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*, which is based in the Faculty of Arts and Architecture (FUA) of TUL. At the time of the EQ-Arts review visit, October 12-15 2019, an application had been submitted by FUA to the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports for accreditation of the new study programme (Bachelor and Masters levels) via the Czech Republic National Agency. The new study programme is due to commence in 2021, and accreditation is due in early 2020. The application for accreditation proposes that the current study programmes *Visual Communication* and *Environmental Design* are merged into one study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* with two levels - Bachelor and Masters level² (first and second cycle of the European Higher Education Framework).

The recent history of FUA at TUL is as follows: “*The Faculty of Arts and Architecture is part of the Technical University of Liberec (TUL). The faculty was established as The Faculty of Architecture by ruling of TUL's Academic Senate on 1 December 1994. Its name has been changed to The Faculty of Art and Architecture of the Technical University of Liberec with effect from 1 January 2007. The faculty's focus is both artistic and technical*”.³ Furthermore, “*the Faculty is a self-governing part of TUL, which independently and freely develops educational, scientific, research, artistic, economic and other activities and creates the necessary conditions for these activities. The scope of self-governing powers and competences of the Faculty and its relation to TUL are defined by Act No. 111/1998 Coll., On Higher Education Institutions, by the TUL Statute and the FUA Statute*”.⁴ The Department of Art (merged from the former Departments of Fine Arts and of Environmental Design), “*guarantees the Bachelor's and Master's study program Fine Arts - Creation in Public Space*”.⁵

Key to this EQ-Arts enhancement review, is the fact that the main document provided by the Faculty of Arts and Architecture, the Self Evaluation Report (SER) for the study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*, was written by the Programme Team at the FUA on the basis of an “*emerging field of study, which has no history at our school, but is based on previous study programs*”⁶. The important task for the Review Team, prior to and during the review visit, was to understand which, of the current pedagogical practices at FUA, are planned to contribute to the new study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*, and what new practices would be needed for its delivery. Additionally, the Review Team had to consider how the new study programme is supported within the wider institutional structures and educational processes of the TUL.

¹ See <http://www.eq-arts.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/EQ-Arts-Standards-mapped-to-ESG-2015.pdf>

² For consistency, the EQ-Arts Review Team refers to the *Fine art - Creation in Public Space* throughout this report as one study programme. However, where necessary and as appropriate to the evidence provided, we differentiate between the Bachelor level and Masters levels of study.

³ SER p.6

⁴ SER p.5

⁵ SER p.9

⁶ SER p.4

Review Team members

Sarah Bennett (Chair)

Dr Sarah Bennett is an artist and Head of the School of Art and Architecture at Kingston University, London, UK. Previous academic leadership positions held include Head of Fine Art at Plymouth University where she subsequently became Interim Head of the School of Art and Media. She has worked in international HE partnerships with Piet Zwart Institute, Rotterdam, and Transart Institute, NYC. Examiner and adviser roles include Wimbledon College of Art (UAL); Birmingham City University; Gray's School of Art, Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen; and UWIC. She exhibits widely in Europe and the UK.

<http://www.kingston.ac.uk/staff/profile/dr-sarah-bennett-444/s.bennett@kingston.ac.uk>

John Butler

Professor John Butler is the Chief Executive Officer of EQ-Arts and Emeritus Professor at Birmingham City University, where he headed the Birmingham School of Art. His professional activities include his work as an exhibiting fine artist, curating, writing and being on Boards of various galleries and network organisations. As past President of the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA), John established ELIA as the EC Thematic Network for the Arts, which was the forerunner of EQ-Arts.

j.butler@eq-arts.org

Klaus Jung

Klaus Jung is a fine artist, photographer, teacher and art-school manager and currently is Head of Fine Art at the Royal Academy of the Arts in The Hague, Netherlands. Klaus Jung worked within art schools in different places around Europe since 1989. Accordingly, his studio frequently had to be moved: from Düsseldorf, to Trondheim, to Bergen, to Glasgow and back to Düsseldorf.

<http://www.klausjung.org/cv.html>

Antoni Remesar

Dr Antoni Remesar is Permanent Professor at the Faculty of Fine Arts, University of Barcelona, Director Polis Research Centre, and of the journal *On the w@terfront*, University of Barcelona. He is a specialist in Public Art and Citizen Participation, and Visiting Professor at the Universities: Catholic of Peru, Costa Rica, Lisbon, Lodz, de la Costa (Colombia), Puebla (Mexico).

aremesar@gmail.com

Lena Passlick (student representative)

Lena Paßlick (b. 1995 in Ochtrup, Germany) is a photographer who lives and studies in The Netherlands. She holds a BA in Fine Art from AKI Academy for Art and Design, Enschede (2018) and is currently pursuing a Master's degree in photography at the Master Institute of Visual Cultures AKV St. Joost, 's Hertogenbosch.

l.passlick@student.avans.nl

EQ-Arts Programme Review: Fine Art – Creation in Public Space

Schedule for Main Site Visit to Technical University Liberec

Monday 13th October		
9.00 - 9.45	Meeting 1 Review Team meet with Dean	Boardroom
10.00 – 11.00	Meeting 2 Review Team meet Study Programme Guarantor for BA and MA	Boardroom
11.15 - 12.45	Tour of facilities inc. Ateliers, Technical workshops, Library, etc.	Atelier F, A1, A0 library, workshop
13.45 -14.30	Meeting 3 Review Team meet BA students of FUA (Visual Communication and Environmental Design)	Atelier F
14.45 -15.30	Meeting 4 Review Team meet MA students of FUA (Visual Communication and Environmental Design)	Atelier F
15.45 - 16.45	Meeting 5 Review Team meet BA and MA Alumni of FUA (Visual Communication and Environmental Design)	Atelier F
Tuesday 14th October		
9.15 – 10.00	Meeting 6 Review Team meet Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, and Instructors for BA FA-CPS	Atelier A1
10.15 – 11.00	Meeting 7 Review Team meet Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, and Instructors for MA FA-CPS	Atelier F
11.15 – 11.45	Meeting 8 Review Team meet Assistants of Ateliers/Technical staff	Atelier F
12.00-12.30	Meeting 9 Review Team meet Research Leads and FUA research active staff	Boardroom
13.30 – 14.30	Meeting 10 Review Team meet Administrative staff (Library, IT, marketing, finance, HR, International, student welfare etc)	Boardroom
14.45 – 15.15	Meeting 11 Review Team meet with FUA Quality Assurance Coordinator (or equivalent)	Boardroom
15.30 - 16.30	Meeting 12 Review Team meet representatives of Professional stakeholders/employers	Galerie Lázně
17:00 – 18:00	Meeting 13 Review Team meet with reps from: Faculty Senate (including student rep) and Student Association (AUF)	Boardroom
Wednesday 15th October		
9.00 - 9.30	Meeting 14 Review Team meet Dean, Vice Dean, Head of Department, and Study Programme Guarantors for clarification of any points	Boardroom
12.30 - 12.45	Oral feedback by Review Team to FUA TUL	Boardroom

1. Programme's goals and context

Standard: the programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission

The Technical University of Liberec (TUL) profiles itself as a university focusing in the fields of technical sciences and mathematics, social and pedagogical sciences, arts and health. The Review Team found that TUL clearly states its vision *“rests on excellent and developed scientific background, exploits the synergetic effect of individual parts of the university, emphasizes interdisciplinarity in educational activities, research and development”* and its mission is *“scientific, engineering, research, development, innovation and artistic activity, aiming at the systematic development of these areas based mainly on basic research”*.⁷

The Review Team commends these objectives but notes there is minimal reference to the Faculty of Arts and Architecture in its *Strategic Development Plan 2020 with a forward view to 2030*, significantly in the section on ‘Research and Development’, where this new programme can play an important role.

EQ-Arts has been invited by the University to review a newly proposed Bachelor and Masters (BA & MA) study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*, to be accredited by the Czech Republic National Agency next year and expects its first cohort of student to commence in 2021. This new programme will be located in the Faculty of Arts and Architecture (FUA), a self-governing part of TUL, which independently and freely develops educational, scientific, research, artistic, economic and other activities and creates the necessary conditions for these activities.⁸

During its site visit the Review Team found the Faculty of Arts and Architecture to be in a period of rapid change and development. The Team fully supports the new Dean’s (arrived December 2018) vision and ambition wanting *“to move on from the old times,”*⁹ but based on feedback during our meetings and documents provided (including the SER) the identity and uniqueness of FUA is not sufficiently concise or clearly presented - *“The strategic plan is under development and will be a long term plan, with goals set for 5, 10 and 15 years,”*¹⁰ and the Review Team would like to stress that this is an ideal opportunity for the Faculty to move forward and achieve those aims.

In 2011 the Czech Republic referenced its education and qualification systems, the National Qualifications System (NQS)¹¹ to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) and the qualifications awarded within higher education. The national qualifications system is bound to the European Qualifications Framework and the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports is responsible for the NQS.

The University has since 2017 produced a comprehensive guideline¹² for Quality Assurance and an internal Quality Evaluation System, which defines the rules of the quality assurance system of the educational, scientific, research, development, innovative, artistic, or other creative activities. The University states, *“evaluation is based on verified qualitative and quantitative data and consists of a critical evaluation of the findings”*.¹³ The rules, procedures and evaluation criteria are clearly published in the public section of the TUL website.

As part of the internal accreditation process the BA and MA in *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* was approved by the Art and Scientific Council of the Faculty of Arts and Architecture of the Technical University of Liberec (UVR FUA TUL) on 21.5.19 and by the Council for Internal Evaluation of the Technical University of Liberec (RVH TUL) on the 22.7.19.

The new programme has been created through the merging of two existing study programmes, Visual Communication: Digital Media and Environmental Design with the emphasis now placed on creation in public space. The aims of the new study programme are *“to provide students (environmental designers) with higher education, a broader perspective and*

⁷ Annex 12 TUL Strategic Development Plan for 2020 with a forward view to 2030 pp.2-3

⁸ SER p.5 defined by Act No. 111/1998 Coll., On Higher Education Institutions, by the TUL Statute and the FUA Statute.

⁹ Meeting 1 with the Dean

¹⁰ Meeting 1 with the Dean

¹¹ Annex 15 Eurydice national qualifications framework pp.2-3

¹² Annex 6 Rules of the Quality Assurance and internal Quality Evaluation System of the Technical University of Liberec, 13.11.17

¹³ Annex 6 Rules of the Quality Assurance and internal Quality Evaluation System of the Technical University of Liberec, 13.11.17 p.3

critical thinking in the field of public space creation".¹⁴ and "to thoroughly research and analyse the relationships between art, private and public space, and all the circumstances of their interaction".¹⁵ The standard length of the Bachelor programme will be 4 years and the Masters will be 2 years, with the student cohort size and profile in line with the existing courses, so the student capacity and profile can be sustained.

The Review Team commends the rationale for the new study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* that develops current practice into improved practice that is more focussed on creation in the social context, and found there was strong endorsement by key stakeholders: current students; teachers; alumni and professional stakeholders/employers for the need for this new programme. The new study programme title is distinctive in a national context and the programme will provide a truer reflection of actual study objectives in the student learning experience based in a multi-disciplinary learning environment.

The Review Team finds the new study programme clearly reflects the University's vision and mission in emphasising interdisciplinary and innovative artistic practice. But whilst there is an understanding and engagement at a regional and national level in the field and how the programme is positioned within that context, the Review Team believed there was a need for the programme to look more closely at related, advanced developments in the field within an International context.

After the reading the SER, the Programme Annual Report 2017 and through meetings with the Faculty and programme management, teaching staff and students, the Review Team struggled to find a clear internal quality process to help it ensure quality and standards of the programme, especially in this multi-disciplinary context (see also Standards 4 and 7). Other than The Register of Artistic Outcomes (RUV)¹⁶ on their teaching staff's 'artistic outputs,' the Review Team found it difficult to find qualitative and quantitative measures used to ensure quality and enhancement of the programme in line with the University's processes.

Through its meetings with current students and teaching staff the Review Team heard about formal consultation on the new study programme, and during its meetings¹⁷ with graduates and some employers there had been good informal exchanges with the Faculty. The former consultation is a more established process through regular student meetings with the Dean and survey questionnaires etc., but the Review Team believe that after experiencing the keenness expressed by the professional field representatives, the Faculty should establish a mechanism to capture this experience and offer (see also Standard 8).

After the Review Team visit, it was clarified by TUL that Equal Opportunities policy is covered within the Ethics Code for Employees and Students¹⁸ and that the "Ethics Code obliges both staff and students to refuse discrimination on grounds of gender, race, ideology, religion, nationality, age, sexual orientation or physical disability. It forbids any type of abuse of position at any level of the organizational structure for the personal benefit or benefit of other people or entities. Any breach of such principles are subject to Ethical Committee proceedings". Furthermore, the Dean advised that equal opportunities is covered by provision of "kindergarten, children's corner, home office schemes and part-time contracts. Great emphasis is put on non-discrimination based on physical disability by barrier free access to all Faculty premises"¹⁹. The Review Team suggests that it would be useful if the TUL could collate all the Equal opportunities information under one policy and measures, as this will be useful for this new programme, as *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* is strongly aligned to working with communities and well-being.

¹⁴ Annex 18; Application for accreditation of Bachelors study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* p.4

¹⁵ Annex 19 Application for accreditation of Masters study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* p.3

¹⁶ SER p.19

¹⁷ Meeting 5 with Alumni and Meeting 12 with Professional stakeholders/Employers

¹⁸ Annex 7

¹⁹ Email from the Dean of Faculty, 20.1.20

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 1

Comments

1. The Review Team fully endorses the new Dean's vision and ambition wanting "to move on from the old times";
2. The Review Team acknowledges the internal process within the Faculty and TUL by which this study programme proposal has been approved before being sent to the Ministry.

Commendations

1. The vision, mission and aims of the Technical University Liberec are clear and appropriate;
2. The rationale for the new study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* that develops current practice into improved practice that is more focussed on creation in the social context, was strongly endorsed by key stakeholders, current students, teachers, alumni and professional stakeholders/employers, and it was clear there is the need for this new programme.
3. The new study programme title is distinctive in a national context and the programme will provide a truer reflection of actual study objectives in the student learning experience based in a multi-disciplinary learning environment.

Recommendations

1. The Faculty takes this opportunity to align the new study programme to related advanced developments in the field within an International context, for example using staff mobility;
2. The Faculty would benefit from defining their qualitative and quantitative measures used to ensure quality and standards of the new programme in line with the University's processes, as part of developing an internal quality process (see Standard 7), in addition to the rich and informative informal communication between students and academic staff;
3. The new FUA Strategic Plan would be enhanced by developing an action points and regular evaluation of progress within the Faculty;

The Review Team find that FUA TUL would be overall **substantially compliant** in Standard 1 for the new study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*.

2. Educational processes

2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery

Standard: the goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery

The institutional process in place²⁰ for the design, approval and re-approval of the new programmes at Bachelor and Masters, *Fine Art – Creation in Public Space* commences with the accreditation application being reviewed by the Faculty Senate²¹. The Review Team heard in its meeting with members of the Faculty Senate that the application was discussed and that the students on Faculty Senate agreed that the new study programme was a ‘good idea’, but there was no vote held (see also Standard 6.2). The Accreditation Application was then sent to the Faculty's Art and Scientific Council²² “for discussion, critical remarks, and after completion for approval”.²³ The Review team learned in its meeting with the Dean and the study programme Guarantor that some external members of the Art and Scientific Council sought clarification about why the school was proposing changes at this point in time, and external architects on the Council recommended inserting more urban planning into the new study programme because the Faculty could easily offer this distinguishing feature. In general, we heard that the views were accepted in a very positive way, on the basis that *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* would be the only public art programme in the Czech Republic. The Accreditation Application was then sent to the University's Internal Evaluation Board²⁴ for discussion, critical comments and for approval. Subsequently it was sent by the University to the National Accreditation Office of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic. Accreditation is currently awaited, which will be for a period of up to 10 years²⁵.

The curricula in the Bachelors programme (4 years duration) and Masters programme (2 years duration) “are planned as a two-stage university degree organized in a series of two separate accredited degree programs”.²⁶ They align in general to the institutional mission but they reflect it more particularly in “emphasising interdisciplinarity in educational activities”²⁷ in that they introduce students to methods, theories, histories and practices of art, design and architecture through its varied contributing courses. These are put into practice and tested in “the significant proportion of Atelier teaching”.²⁸ With a focus on technical sciences and arts, the *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* identifies “public shared spaces formed by civil society as its context and aims to provide students (environmental designers) with higher education, a broader perspective and critical thinking in the field of public space creation”.²⁹ The Review Team considered that the new two credit courses Art and Public Space 1 and 2 in the second year of the BA, taught by a recently appointed member of staff, are pivotal in developing students’ critical thinking in relation to the wide field of art in public space. However, the Review Team believe it could be introduced earlier in the BA and have a larger credit weighting. The same new tutor

²⁰ SER p.12

²¹ The Academic Senate of the Faculty is its self-governing representative academic body. It has at least nine members, of which at least one third and at most one half are students. The members of the Academic Senate of the Faculty are elected from among the members of the Academic Community of the Faculty (SER p.12)

²² The Chair of the Artistic and Scientific Council is the Dean who appoints and removes other members of the Artistic and Scientific Council. The members of the Scientific Board of a public higher education institution are prominent representatives of fields in which the higher education institution carries out educational and creative activities. At least one third of the members are persons other than members of the academic community of the university (SER p.12)

²³ SER p.12

²⁴ The University's Internal Evaluation Board is chaired by the Rector. The Vice-Chairman of the Board is appointed by the Rector of the academic staff of the public higher education institution who are professors or docents of the public higher education institution (SER p.12)

²⁵ SER p. 12

²⁶ Annexes 18 and 19 Applications for accreditation of Bachelors and Masters study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* p.4

²⁷ Annex 12 The TUL Strategic Development Plan for 2020 with a forward view to 2030 p.6

²⁸ SER p.10

²⁹ SER p.9

supervises theses for the MA, and we heard in the meeting with Heads of Ateliers and teachers that at Masters level critically important key texts are introduced, and students are expected to be able to self-manage their learning.

The Review Team read that “students can provide feedback to the curricula and teaching strategies through the AUF Student Association”³⁰ and this was confirmed by the students³¹ who are members of Senate. However, the BA students³² commented that architecture has greater representation on AUF than art. The BA students were generally positive about the new study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*, but had not contributed directly to its development.

While the Review Team supports the ambition of the new study programme at both BA and MA, we were unable to locate any Programme Intended Learning Outcomes before or during the visit following our requests. The Review Team note that with regards to the *Czech Republic National Referencing Report (2011)* the “Czech Republic has referenced its education and qualification systems to the EQF, i.e. qualifications awarded: within the system of initial basic, secondary, and tertiary professional education; and within the system of higher education”.³³ The Review Team would therefore expect TUL to use the EQF as one of the “European instruments to support the clarity, transparency, and comparability of educational systems”³⁴. The Review Team strongly believe that the development of clear intended learning outcomes mapped to EQF and Subject Dublin Descriptors’ learning outcomes (and published in a student handbook), would ensure comparability of expected levels of graduate attainment within the European Higher Education sector, alongside the ECTS which are currently “considered as a tool ensuring the transparency and international comparability of study programs”.³⁵ The Review Team found that BA students’ understanding of ECTS varied, and the statement regarding credits in the SER³⁶ is also confusing. The development of Learning Outcomes would also assist in differentiating the profile of graduates of the Bachelor from the graduates of the Masters, which is outlined under the heading “Profile of a graduate of the study programme,”³⁷ for example the level of independence expected of a graduate having fulfilled either programme, as well as articulating progression between BA to MA of *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*. The Review Team acknowledge that connections within FUA are formed by the use of “common spaces - atelier, workrooms, classrooms – which are shared with architecture students”.³⁸

Although PhD provision is outside the scope of this critical friends review, nonetheless the Review Team were pleased to meet a substantial number of Masters alumni from the current programmes who have progressed to doctoral study at FUA. We hope that artistic research (practice-led) can be encouraged and developed and that habilitation support will increase supervisory capacity.

On the new Bachelor study programme each student will follow a number of mandatory courses and will have the option of choosing 8 credits from optional courses,³⁹ which facilitates an individual study profile. Each Masters student’s proposal for study, on entry to the new programme, will further provide the opportunity to develop an individual study profile, as happens in the current programmes, and this will be complimented by the optional courses⁴⁰. The Alumni⁴¹ that the Review Team met stated that they had had ‘total freedom’, and were able to ‘build individualism’ in their study

³⁰ SER p.12

³¹ Meeting 3 with BA students

³² The students the Review Team met were studying on either the Visual Communication/Digital Media programme or Environmental Design, and represented different year groups.

³³ Annex 15 Eurydice national qualifications framework

³⁴ Annex 15 Eurydice national qualifications framework

³⁵ SER p.10

³⁶ SER p.14

³⁷ Annexes 18 and 19 Applications for accreditation of Bachelors and Masters study programme *Fine Art – Creation in Public Space* p.4

³⁸ SER p.13

³⁹ Annex 18 Application for accreditation of Bachelors study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* pp.12-13

⁴⁰ Annex 18 Application for accreditation of Bachelors study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* pp.8-9

⁴¹ Meeting 5 with Alumni

programme, and we understand that the new study programmes are modelled with the same intention. While the students valued the openness in the choice of student projects, among the Alumni there was general agreement that they found it difficult to find the value/usefulness of some of the 2 credit modules⁴². Once the new study programme is running the Faculty should take the opportunity, through its internal quality process⁴³, to regularly review the programme curriculum to reflect upon the content and structure of the programme (subject to Ministry accreditation regulations).

The Review Team read⁴⁴ that *the range of educational and teaching strategies is brief to allow the interpretation of the personalities that teach them. Strategies are not described in detail and allow the freedom of the teacher*. Whilst we heard that the BA students appreciate the different approaches of the teaching staff as a whole, the Review Team believes that the sharing of good practice in pedagogy, and mandatory attendance at staff development workshops to maintain up-to-date teaching practice (see also Standard 4.1) would enable FUA to reassure itself - linked to quality enhancement, that the teaching strategies on the new study programme meet the required quality standards.

Critical and self-reflection in students is currently encouraged through *supporting the initiative of students who organize the student competition*⁴⁵. Whilst the Review Team consider this is a valuable extra curricula activity, the acquisition of critical reflection at BA and Masters level should be embedded as learning outcomes mapped to curriculum and teaching methods.

The Review Team read that decision-making will be based on *“performing an analysis of the situation in both educational and research activities that will lead to the definition of the standards of knowledge for each type of study and to the development of the quality and specialization of study programmes and subject-areas, to the creation of new disciplines and inter-faculty disciplines, taking into account the future needs of society and the employment of graduates”*.⁴⁶ The Review Team were not aware of such an analysis regarding research explicitly informing the development of the new study programme, and it is clearly stated in the SER that *“neither the bachelor's nor the master's program is conducted as a research program”*.⁴⁷ However, the Review Team understand that the artistic activities of staff (RUV) implicitly informed the direction of *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* rather than research feeding explicitly into students' assignments, activities and tasks. The Review Team welcome the emphasis and support given to staff research activities by the recently appointed Dean and the introduction of the new PhD programme in Fine Art which provides an opportunity to establish awareness of research (specifically artistic research) at all levels of the programme aligned to *“developing a system of interconnection of education with research, development, innovation, arts and other creative activities, especially in follow-up and doctoral study programmes”*.⁴⁸ Furthermore, given the research aspirations of FUA, and that *“TUL sees the priority in interdisciplinary research, which results from educational activities in terms of technical sciences, social sciences, economics, health sciences, and art,”*⁴⁹ the Review Team recommends that FUA should consider changing the research methodologies course on the MA⁵⁰ from optional to compulsory (subject to Ministry Accreditation regulations). This would also reflect TUL's plan to *“create an offer of study programmes conceived with the research element of the university with regard to the future employment of graduates in the labour market”*.⁵¹

⁴² Meeting 5 with Alumni

⁴³ Annex 6 TUL Quality Assurance and Internal Quality Evaluation document

⁴⁴ SER p.13

⁴⁵ SER p.13

⁴⁶ Annex 13 TUL Strategic Plan for the Scholarly, Research and other Creative Activities 2016 – 2020 p.25

⁴⁷ SER p.13

⁴⁸ Annex 12 The TUL Strategic Development Plan for 2020 with a forward view to 2030 p.19

⁴⁹ Annex 12 The TUL Strategic Development Plan for 2020 with a forward view to 2030 p.8

⁵⁰ Meeting 9 with Research Leads and FUA research active staff

⁵¹ Annex 12 The TUL Strategic Development Plan for 2020 with a forward view to 2030 p.7

Regarding formal arrangements for students to receive academic, career and personal guidance within the BA, which ‘*aims to prepare students for a profession or to continue to Master’s programmes*,’⁵² the students⁵³ did not think that their Bachelors programme had an emphasis on introducing career opportunities after study. The Review Team heard from MA students⁵⁴ that they have conversations with teachers on the topic of career opportunities, and that this is how they get ‘contacts’. However, in the meeting with Administrators the Review Team heard that there is a Centre for Career Advice in the Faculty of Economics, which is available to all students and there is an incubator under TUL, which helps small start-ups. It was mentioned that about 25% of FUA students set up their own businesses.⁵⁵

There was consensus among the Alumni that there is a need for more preparation for the ‘world of work’, although they viewed the professors as good role models for professional practice. The Review Team read that cooperation with ‘practice’ takes place on the “*basis of compulsory practice of students in relevant organizations and organized excursions of students in the education to the corresponding organizations within the program*”.⁵⁶ In the meeting with BA Heads of Ateliers and teachers⁵⁷ we were informed that these internships must relate to studio work, and that students find a company or organisation themselves and that the Department is now preparing rules for this process, ahead of the new study programme in which more interaction with external organisations is envisaged. The Review Team noted that the internship involves each student making a public presentation for teachers and students⁵⁸, but BA students stated⁵⁹ that they also organise exhibitions themselves or *Erasmus exhibitions*.

2.2 International perspectives

Standard: the programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective

The international strategy of TUL has three priorities for 2020-2030:

The first is the expansion of “*international professional cooperation with important partners from around the world*”.⁶⁰ The Review Team heard that FUA intend to expand the number of international collaborations and agreements further, in readiness for the start of the new study programme, but that extra curricula opportunities already exist for students such as the participation in a lighting festival in Japan. We heard⁶¹ that visits by representatives of TUL FUA have been made to Kiev, Zurich, Japan and Milan. The second priority is “*increase the share of integration of international students and academic employees into educational and research activities*”.⁶² The TUL Mobility Fund supported a healthy number of incoming experts and outgoing pedagogues and PhD students⁶³, which aids the development of teachers’ international expertise and supports “*non-European, short- term or specific mobility deigned for employees and students of master or doctoral studies. The [mobility]fund primarily supports participation in foreign conferences, specialized foreign workshops or short-term research and study placements in foreign institutions*”.⁶⁴ The third priority is ensuring “*adequate and effective short and long-term international mobility options of students, academics and non-academics*”.⁶⁵ The Review

⁵² SER p.7

⁵³ Meeting 3 with BA students

⁵⁴ Meeting 4 with MA students

⁵⁵ Meeting 10 with Administrative staff

⁵⁶ SER pp18-19

⁵⁷ Meeting 6 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, and Instructors - BA

⁵⁸ SER p.13 and Meeting 6 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, and Instructors - BA

⁵⁹ Meeting 3 with BA students

⁶⁰ TUL Strategic Development Plan for 2020 with a forward view to 2030 p.32

⁶¹ Meeting 10 with Administrative staff

⁶² TUL Strategic Development Plan for 2020 with a forward view to 2030 p.32

⁶³ Annex 16 FUA Annual Activity Report 2017 pp.36-38

⁶⁴ SER p.14

⁶⁵ TUL Strategic Development Plan for 2020 with a forward view to 2030 p.32

Team read that in 2017 there were 15 bilateral agreements with Foreign universities and additionally exchanges are negotiated for individual students and, through Erasmus+ 15 FUA students made study visits; 5 FUA students went on traineeships; and there were 18 incoming students to FUA⁶⁶. The Review Team also read that “*courses taught in foreign languages are offered to students coming to FUA TUL under the Erasmus+ program*”.⁶⁷ While the Review Team found that FUA international activities are aligned to the TUL strategic plan, nonetheless we heard from the Alumni⁶⁸ that they would have wished for: more international opportunities with a greater choice of institutions; more foreign language provision/tuition, particularly in English; and more visiting international lecturers - although they understood this was currently changing (see also Standard 4.2). The Review Team commends the regular lecture programme involving international speakers and the search for new collaborative partners for Erasmus, and other projects

In terms of international perspectives within the curriculum for the new BA study programme, there are two optional courses that focus on non-European architecture⁶⁹. The compulsory course reading lists, however, confirm a mainly western perspective with a strong leaning to Czech references. In order to address international perspectives in the curriculum the Review Team believe that it could be addressed by adding more renowned international/global texts to the reading lists and embedding intended learning outcomes, explicitly formulated and linked to internationalisation, in studio practice and the students’ own projects.

International students are supported on the programme by the International Office publishing English translations of important documents upon requests from individual parts of the University. Furthermore, the Review Team heard from the Faculty Erasmus Coordinator about the comprehensive induction for international students which commences with welcome week activities and an introduction to processes of the University organised by the International Office. After meeting in the hall to hear about common features in TUL, the Faculty Coordinators take students to their own Faculty to sign for their courses, to sign their learning agreements, and show them round the facilities. If the international students have any problems they are invited to contact Faculty coordinators.

With regards quality assurance linked to internationalisation the Review Team read the Annual Activity Report for 2017 and noted the international exchanges and events listed, and are confident that FUA intends to further extend these activities. However, as there is no systematic quality process or analysis of Annual Activity data, the Review Team recommend that FUA develops an internal quality assurance and enhancement process to include international activities (see also Standard 7).

2.3 Assessment

Standard: assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes

Currently assessment (evaluation) of BA and MA semester projects are undertaken by leading studio teachers and may include teachers from theoretical courses. External guest critics from the professional community are also invited for assessments of semester projects⁷⁰. The Review Team read that *Studio work assessment is the sum of several factors, namely work during the semester - attendance and diligence, artistic quality of the semester project - which is the most important factor, as well as the ability of rhetoric in defense - the student is able to defend his/her work. The last factor is the quality of project implementation. By the sum of these factors the student is evaluated 1-4 (excellent, very good,*

⁶⁶ Annex 16 FUA Annual Activity Report 2017 p.35

⁶⁷ SER p.14

⁶⁸ Meeting 5 with Alumni

⁶⁹ Annex 18 Application for accreditation of Bachelors study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*

⁷⁰ SER p.15

insufficient)⁷¹. The BA students the Review Team met⁷² found the formative assessments in the studio that take place every 14 days, very useful, and welcomed the regular verbal feedback and grades (A-D) which they said informed the evolution of their work. The Review Team heard that the posting of final grades (1-4) on the internal IS/STAG⁷³ for students has been adopted by all teachers (after a slow start), and also that IS/STAG is considered to be an improvement on the old system.⁷⁴ The Review Team recommend that written feedback should be introduced at key points in the new study programme, to build upon the constructive verbal formative feedback.

There is a Final State Examination (FSE) in Art History in the BA at the end of semester 8, and a Bachelor Thesis (FSE) - the components and content are listed in the BA accreditation application⁷⁵. There is a Final State Examination (FSE) in Art History in the MA at the end of semester 4, and a Master Thesis (FSE) - again, the components and content are listed in the MA accreditation application⁷⁶. Study and exam regulations are clearly set out⁷⁷, including regulations for retakes. The Review Team noted that there was no consensus among the BA students whether a retake of studio work is possible.

While assessment methods are broadly aligned with the teaching and learning methods, the Review Team have concern about the number of assessments linked to small credit courses, and whether this leads to over assessment. Furthermore, the Review Team did not read any published assessment criteria, although we heard that the two ateliers will have the same criteria in the new study programme and that these criteria are being devised⁷⁸. The Review Team concurs that assessment criteria will need to be agreed and clearly stated. They need to be aligned to the Programme Learning Outcomes, that also need to be written. The Review Team advises that students will benefit if Learning Outcomes, assessment criteria, and information on exam regulations are published in a student handbook.

Comments, commendations, and recommendations for improvement for Standard 2

Comments

3. The Review Team acknowledges that current students value the openness in the choice of the studio projects.

Commendations

4. The ambition of the new study programme at BA and MA;
5. The internships in year 4 of the current programmes;
6. The regular lecture programme involving international speakers and the search for new collaborative partners for Erasmus, and other projects;
7. The continuous verbal formative assessment which is highly valued by current BA students.

Recommendations

4. In order to support the spirit of renewal and enhancement currently underway, and once the new study programme is running, the Review Team advises that the Faculty should take the opportunity, through its internal quality process, to regularly review the programme curriculum to reflect upon the content and structure (subject

⁷¹ SER p.14

⁷² Meeting 3 with BA students

⁷³ IS/STAG is the Information system/study agenda (SER p.8)

⁷⁴ Meeting 10 with Administrators

⁷⁵ Annex 18 Application for accreditation of Bachelors study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* pp.13-14

⁷⁶ Annex 19 Application for accreditation of Masters study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* pp.9-10

⁷⁷ Annex 3 The Study and Exam Regulations of the Technical University Liberec as of 13.08.18

⁷⁸ Meeting 6 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, and Instructors - BA

to Ministry accreditation regulations). Also, to check that it is delivering its aims and objectives and providing a coherent learning experience and that students are not being over assessed;

5. Programme Learning Outcomes need to be written and clearly stated for the new BA and MA study programme and mapped to relevant subject benchmarking statements;
6. The Faculty should use the opportunity, that the new PhD programme affords, to establish an understanding of research (specifically artistic research) at all levels of the new study programme and that an introduction to a methodological approach to research is considered as a compulsory part of the master curriculum (subject to Ministry accreditation regulations);
7. Consideration of how to better inform students of employment opportunities and prepare them for the world of work at both BA and MA;
8. International perspectives could be better embedded in the new study programme curriculum, e.g. in learning outcomes at BA and MA;
9. Assessment criteria need to be agreed and clearly stated and aligned to the programme learning outcomes, when written, for BA and MA;
10. Written feedback for final (summative) assessments should be introduced for new study programme at key points in the students' study period;
11. Students would benefit if Learning outcomes, assessment criteria, and information on exam regulations could be published in a student handbook for both BA and MA, along with the content of the current study guides.

The Review Team find that FUA TUL would be overall **non-compliant**⁷⁹ in Standard 2 for the new study programme, *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* (see Section 9 for compliance of 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3).

⁷⁹As this study programme is not yet running this finding is conjectural, in that if learning outcomes and assessment criteria are not in place and published in a programme, that programme would be non-compliant in Standard 2, under EQ-Arts Standards, which are aligned to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG).

3. Student profiles

3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications

Standard: there are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme

The SER states that 58 students were enrolled on the current BA programmes and 19 on the MA programmes in the academic year 2018/19, a total of 79 students⁸⁰. This is about 31% of the Faculty of Arts and Architecture⁸¹. Accordingly, every year approximately 15 students are admitted to BA level and 10 to MA level. The Review Team learned that numbers will stay the same when the two existing study programmes merge into the new programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*. When admission to the new programme starts, admission to the old programmes will cease.

The Review Team learned from the SER and the meetings that *“the admission procedure for the Bachelor's degree is two-round and takes place on two following days”*.⁸² Work on an assignment (*an art project*⁸³) and a general test are followed by an interview and *“he/she elaborates a reflection on the topic”*.⁸⁴ We heard that during the interview questions are asked about cultural knowledge, films, passions and exhibitions the applicants have seen.⁸⁵ Successful candidates must provide proof, that they have completed high school. The Review Team learned, that specific high schools (gymnasium) in the Czech Republic prepare for Higher Art Education.⁸⁶

For admission to the MA programme it is expected that applicants have completed either the BA programme at the Faculty or in a *“similar field at another university”*.⁸⁷ MA students confirmed in the meeting that about two thirds of their cohort come from the BA at the FUA. The admissions process consists of a *personal portfolio, presentation of a personal study project and an oral interview*⁸⁸, asking for reflection on the previous work.

The BA process is designed to determine, if the applicant has *“demonstrated the required level of complex talent and other prerequisites for the study of design,”*⁸⁹ and *“emphasis is placed on artistic talent and the ability of independent creative and critical thinking”*.⁹⁰ At MA level *“passion for visual art, but also generally the passion for the outside world and current events, visual quality, art skills, and spatial intelligence”*⁹¹ is appreciated. During the meetings it was made clear by the Heads of Ateliers, that the programme is looking for students with an open mind. This has been confirmed by students⁹², saying that the BA programme helps to open the mind and to enhance individual creativity. The Heads of the Ateliers are involved in the interview process, and there is a possibility to invite external guests⁹³.

The admissions process follows in principle such standards, which are common in European Higher Art Education. The Review Team was pleased to hear, that the Faculty keeps good links to general higher education, especially to high schools (gymnasium) which specialise on preparing for proceeding to Higher Art Education. As the process of acceptance for the new programme is still in process (a first intake is planned for 2021) new information material will be developed and sent to high-schools as a source of information and inspiration for new applicants. Students spoke about the opportunity to prepare via a two-week summer school and contact with the Faculty when preparing their portfolio. In the meeting with the Heads of Ateliers and teachers we learned that the introduction of a year Zero (0) with workshops prior to the admissions process could be discussed as an option.

All of this is commendable and demonstrates that the Faculty endeavours to foster qualified applicants through the admissions process, led by the goal to select candidates, which have the potential to finish the programme successfully.

⁸⁰ SER p.5

⁸¹ If doctoral students were included it would be more than 50% (Email from Dean of Faculty 20.1.20)

⁸² SER p.15

⁸³ SER p.15

⁸⁴ SER p.15

⁸⁵ Meeting 6 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, and Instructors - BA

⁸⁶ Meeting 2 with Programme Guarantor

⁸⁷ SER p.16

⁸⁸ SER p.16

⁸⁹ SER p.15 Section 49 (1) Of Act No. 111/1998 Coll of The Higher Education act

⁹⁰ SER p.16

⁹¹ SER p.16

⁹² Meeting 3 with BA students

⁹³ SER p.16

However, the entry criteria mentioned tend to be overly vague and leave space for interpretation. The Review Team recommends to look for clarification of what is expected from applicants. The information material about the new programme, which it is planned will be sent to high schools, could be an opportunity to also communicate clearer about, how the entry requirements assess the abilities to successfully complete the study programme.

3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability

Standard: the programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students

The main source for information for teachers about student progression, and progress in their learning over the duration of the programme are *“frequent meetings of leaders of ateliers and teachers from other programs”*.⁹⁴ In addition the information system IS / STAG keeps information on students and this is where *“the teacher can find the student's evaluation from other courses, including the previous semesters”*.⁹⁵ The work of selected students, which has *“gone through discussion and evaluation”*⁹⁶ is regularly published in a yearbook. The SER states that *“students’ own initiative, such as organizing exhibitions or participating in announced competitions,”* is monitored and *“observed through discussions and individual consultations”*.⁹⁷

A compulsory element of the curriculum - *“during the Bachelor's degree, students must complete at least one semester of practical experience in the field”*⁹⁸ – is intended to prepare students for a professional practice. The Review Team learned that the students have to find a company or organisation themselves and that rules for this are under development (see also Standard 2.1). At the end of the placement students make a presentation and they have to send a report three times during the placement/internship. In the meeting⁹⁹ with professional field the Review Team learned, that they did not see any particular differences in the skills/attributes of TUL FUA students compared to other students from arts universities but they believed that the Liberec students were more social and friendlier, and thought that it was positive that they wanted to stay in Liberec and give back to the communities.

Former graduates¹⁰⁰ informed the Review Team, that they also remember a course for professional development called ‘Management’. As already noted (see also Standard 2.1), the graduates saw the professors as good role models for their professional practice, but alumni also clearly see a need for more preparation for the ‘world of work’. The topic of career opportunities and making professional contacts was discussed in meetings with the Heads of Ateliers.

The experience of international exchange is important to widen the view of a potential world of work also for students in Higher Art Education. The Review Team heard that graduates who have been on an international exchange valued this experience highly¹⁰¹. However other students wanted to have a greater choice for international student mobility (see also Standard 2.2).

The Review Team learned, that the aim of the new programme will be similar to the current programmes, which is to make better professional artists, being employable not only in the cultural world as artists or in design businesses, but also in city halls, public institutions, and able to cooperate with the public¹⁰².

In relation to employability the SER states that *“information about graduates is not collected by the program, only statistics obtained from publicly available sources are kept,”*¹⁰³ for example the *“unemployment statistics of university graduates of*

⁹⁴ SER p.17

⁹⁵ SER p.17

⁹⁶ SER p.17

⁹⁷ SER p.17

⁹⁸ SER p.17

⁹⁹ Meeting 12 with Professional stakeholders/employers

¹⁰⁰ Meeting 5 with alumni

¹⁰¹ Meeting 5 with Alumni

¹⁰² Meeting 7 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, and Instructors - MA

¹⁰³ SER p.16

the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs".¹⁰⁴ It is also made clear that *graduates are mostly self-employed*. The *Roliz KA4 project* collected data on 41 graduates from 2018. *The research will continue and the evaluation will be reflected in 2019*".¹⁰⁵

The SER also states that *"at TUL, the degree of success in the admission procedure, the degree of failure in the study program and the degree of due completion of the study program are monitored and evaluated using the analytical tools of the IS / STAG information system,*"¹⁰⁶ which leads to annual activity reports. The assessment of the activity reports and *"suggestions i.e. from students"* are used *"to improve the quality of teaching and the overall environment at the faculty"*.¹⁰⁷

The Review Team understands the close relationship between teachers and students which characterises art and design education, specifically at schools and faculties with comparably small numbers of students. We commend the Faculty for developing a rather close meshed safety net for the progression of the best students out of this, through public exposure in the yearbook, advise and contacts for professional partners and informal discussion about the students' development in their own work. This relates to progression throughout the programme as well as to transition to a professional practice. Although alumni would have wished for more preparation, a certain standard is maintained through the engagement of teachers for their best students.

We recommend however that the Faculty should develop a formal way to monitor the progress of all students by using clear learning outcomes for each stage of the learning process (see also Standard 2.1), to enable every student to have a clear understanding of where they stand in their learning process at any time.

Comments, commendations, and recommendations for improvement for Standard 3

Comments

4. As the process of accreditation for the new programme is still in process (a first intake is planned for 2021) new information material will be developed and sent to high-schools as a source of information and inspiration for new applicants;
5. The Review team acknowledges, that a small faculty, such as FUA at TUL, has the potential to develop close informal monitoring of students' progression.

Commendations

8. The Faculty's good links to general education, especially to high schools (gymnasium) which specialise in preparing for proceeding to Higher Art education;
9. The teaching team for its engagement to support their best students, also beyond completion of the current programmes.

Recommendations

12. The Review Team found that the application process was fair and fit for its purpose. However, we advise that progress needs to be made in developing a clear notion of skills and attributes in relation to the aims and learning outcomes of the new programme and that the planned new information material for the intake of 2021 is seen as an opportunity to clarify and publish what the Faculty is looking for in an applicant and what professional practice the programme is preparing for (see Standard 2);

¹⁰⁴ SER p.17

¹⁰⁵ SER p.16 *Roliz* is a Human Resources Development Project

¹⁰⁶ SER p.17

¹⁰⁷ SER p.17

13. The Faculty would benefit from developing a formal way to capture and analyse progress for alumni in their career paths in order to align with University's strategy for enhancement of the programme (see Standard 1);
14. The Faculty considers ways for the alumni to contribute to the new programme (see Standard 6).

The Review Team finds that FUA TUL would be overall **fully compliant** in Standard 3 for the new study programme, *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*.

4. Teaching staff

4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity

Standards: members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/researchers

While there is no requirement for university teachers in the Czech Republic to have a pedagogical education, nonetheless TUL offers its teachers opportunities to attend its own various pedagogical courses¹⁰⁸. This was further discussed in the Review Team's meeting with the FUA Senate¹⁰⁹, in relation to the RoLiZ - Human Resources Development project, e.g. as support for preparing lectures in English.

One of the institutional strategies to support and enhance the teaching staff's artistic, pedagogical, and research activity has only recently been introduced into FUA by the new Dean¹¹⁰, and takes the form of paid sabbaticals of up to 6 months, to support doctoral or habilitation work, publishing and exhibition activities¹¹¹. The Review Team heard that the new PhD programme will benefit from this initiative because it will increase the numbers of habilitated teachers. Additionally, the Faculty is involved in the Register of Artistic Outcomes (RUV), *"a state quality assessment of teachers, where the activity of artistic outputs is measured and schools receive rewards depending on this assessment"*.¹¹² The Dean informed the Review Team that the Register was started six years ago, when the funding system for universities was changed¹¹³, and that he is reviewing how the funding is allocated, for example to support new researchers. Over and above the RUV, staff are encouraged to engage in professional activities that are collated in the Annual Activity Reports such as exhibitions, and we note that *"artistic, scientific and creative activity is a fundamental right and duty of an academic employee of the faculty"*.¹¹⁴ The Review Team heard in the meeting with Researchers¹¹⁵ that all contracted teachers have an allocated percentage of their workload for artistic and scientific research, but the percentage varies. The BA students¹¹⁶ that the Review Team met voiced the benefits and value of staff practice presentations in identifying possible career paths, and were generally positive about their teachers. Alumni valued the openness of teachers' approaches to the creative process.

The Review Team learned that a staff appraisal system is already in place for administrative staff and were pleased to hear¹¹⁷, that an annual appraisal system is in preparation for academics, and will start next year. The Review Team consider that this will provide a valuable formal opportunity for staff to critically evaluate their own performances as teachers and discuss with their line manager any training needs including Continuing Professional Development (CPD). The Review Team note that TUL is asking Faculties to design their own Staff Development events, but heard in the meeting with FUA Senate that these may need to be made compulsory in future¹¹⁸.

¹⁰⁸ SER p.19 and TUL Conditions of Employment Article 33 "includes employer's commitment to support education and continuous professional development by organizing specialized courses, supporting seminars or study visits provided by external subject" (Email from Dean of Faculty 20.1.20).

¹⁰⁹ Meeting 13 with representatives from: Faculty Senate (including student rep), Student Association (AUF)

¹¹⁰ Meeting 1: Paid sabbaticals were already offered in other Faculties. The first FUA paid sabbatical has recently been awarded.

¹¹¹ SER p.19

¹¹² SER p.19

¹¹³ Higher Education funding in the Czech Republic is now not only based on student numbers (Contribution A) but also Contribution K is determined, in part, by the creative activities of staff. Outcomes are collected and rated nationally according to national criteria in the RUV.

¹¹⁴ SER p.19

¹¹⁵ Meeting 9 with Research Leads and FUA research active staff

¹¹⁶ Meeting 3 with BA students

¹¹⁷ Meeting 10 with Administrators

¹¹⁸ The Review Team understands that "TUL Conditions of Employment - article 13 governs an employee's obligations to undertake and continuously improve (maintain, renew) qualifications necessary to perform work defined by employment contract and to participate in training sessions to improve qualification as per employer's scheme" (Email from Dean of Faculty 20.1.20).

The Review Team heard in the meetings with BA and MA Heads of Ateliers and teachers¹¹⁹, and read in the SER¹²⁰ and in the Annual Activity Report¹²¹ that, in addition to their own exhibitions, teachers are involved in extra curricula or ancillary activities, such as participation in a lighting festival in Japan, collaborative projects with other universities, and field trips. In the meeting with BA Heads of Ateliers and teachers the Review Team heard that more collaborations between the dept and external organisations are taking place in the preparation for the new study programme. Two members of staff who the Review Team met spoke positively about their interactions with other Art and Design Schools that enabled them to take a critical perspective on their teaching at TUL FUA. Additionally, staff are involved in Faculty Committees¹²².

4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body

Standard: there is sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programme

The circumstances leading to the proposal of the new Department of Art (KVU) and the new study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*, are such that an existing team of Heads of Ateliers, Associate Professors and Lecturers are already employed on the Environmental Design and Visual Communications/Digital Media Programmes respectively. In the merging of these two programmes emphasis has been placed on the latter so that Fine Art is the grounding discipline, but *within* a multi-dimensional context. The Review Team acknowledge that the extant teachers in KVU reflect this context. Other teachers provide curriculum from the Department of Architecture (KAR) and Department of Art History, Theory and Architecture (KDA) as appropriate. The Review Team noted that the employment of a new teacher with specific research and knowledge in theories of public space has enhanced the professional profile of the current staff, thereby introducing new curriculum content, and the Dean informed the Review Team that new atelier assistants were hired with the idea of the new study programme in mind. There was consensus at the meeting with Alumni¹²³ for more international visiting teachers, an issue recently addressed in the Architecture Lecture series but which could be extended to other disciplines (see also Standard 2.1). The Review Team noted that diversity among staff seems low (e.g. cultural and ethnic background)

The Review Team read in the SER that the staffing composition and volume meet the relevant internal regulations and that the “*number of academic staff responsible for the evaluated study program corresponds to its type and profile, area of education, a form of study, teaching methods and especially the expected number of students*”.¹²⁴ Current BA student numbers in Visual Communication and Environmental Design are 58 and in the MA are 19. The Review Team understand from the meeting with the Dean and Heads of Ateliers that the numbers admitted to the new BA study programme will not increase and in its first cohort (2021) will be 10-15 students¹²⁵ with no more than 20 students across BA and MA located in each studio¹²⁶ (see also Standard 3). There are 22 employees (including external staff) in KVU at present.¹²⁷ The staffing profile is approved within the accreditation file of each study programme. The Review Team heard from the students¹²⁸ that they are satisfied with the ratio of students to teachers.

The Review Team were provided with the *Rules of the Tender Procedures for Appointing Academic and Other Staff* (Annex 9). Additionally, the SER notes that the Head of Department of Art is responsible for the provision of “*sufficiently high-*

¹¹⁹ Meetings 6 and 7 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, and Instructors – BA and MA respectively

¹²⁰ SER p.19

¹²¹ Annex 16 Annual Activity report 2017

¹²² See also Standard 6

¹²³ Meeting 5 with Alumni

¹²⁴ SER p.20

¹²⁵ Annex 18; Application for accreditation of Bachelors study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* p.4

¹²⁶ SER p.21

¹²⁷ SER p.5

¹²⁸ Meeting 3 with BA students

*quality teaching staff*¹²⁹ and that their proposals are submitted for approval by the Dean of the Faculty. The Review Team noted the new staffing additions to the KUV and that this reflects a staff recruitment policy that fosters developments within the new study programme.

Comments, commendations, and recommendations for improvement for Standard 4

Comments

6. The Review Team considers that the forthcoming introduction of a staff appraisal system for academic staff is a very important initiative and that this will provide a formal means by which staff can discuss their professional ambitions and any training needs identified with their line manager;
7. The Review Team welcomes that Technical University Liberec is asking its Faculties to design appropriate staff development activities for their own staff;
8. The Review Team endorses the new addition to the teaching staff with specific knowledge and expertise in public space.
9. The Review Team noted the value of the visiting Architects series, and suggests a similar format in order to diversify the staffing in the new study programme

Commendations

10. The allocation of a negotiated percentage of time for teachers that supports their own artistic practice/research;
11. The New Dean's support for paid sabbaticals for habilitation, and to complete research projects and his review of the way RUV funding is distributed; and the aim to support new researchers;
12. The Practice Presentations by teachers, which helps current students to envisage potential career paths.

The Review Team find that FUA TUL would be overall **fully compliant** in Standard 4 for the new study programme, *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* (see Section 9 for compliance of 4.1 and 4.2)

¹²⁹ SER p.21

5. Facilities, resources and support

5.1 Facilities

Standard: the institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme

An overview of all available TUL teaching rooms is available in the IS/STAG system and specifically for the new study programme in the FUA *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* SER¹³⁰.

A tour of the FUA facilities enabled the Review Team to verify that the Faculty has an extensive studio to accommodate the students for the newly proposed *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* study programme. This space facilitates the studio practice of the BA and MA students, for both working individually and collectively. The Review Team was positive that the students on *Fine Art - Creation in Public* will work in close proximity to each other and with students studying on other programmes. The studio is a well-lit space appropriate for fine art practice, but as the Review Team experienced when holding its meeting with the BA students¹³¹, there is a real noise problem making it difficult to hold a discussion with a group of people (e.g. seminar, group critique etc.), especially if other programmes are working/teaching in that space at the same time. While acknowledging the appropriateness of the studios, the Heads of Ateliers need to reflect on the ethos of off-site working in the new programme and how the studio space will operate in this context.

Adjacent to their studio the Review Team were shown:

- A workshop devoted to the construction of models and 3D making;
This is a relatively small workshop with a selection of electrical tools and equipment. The Review Team believes this is a relatively dangerous working environment with little Health and Safety signage nor protection - hot-wire tools for cutting polystyrene without air extraction, no guards on tools etc. At the meetings with current students¹³² the Review Team were informed that there was little technical oversight in the use of the space and the machines, but they did receive a general introduction on safety issues at the beginning of their study programme. The MA students said that the architecture students used the workshop much more and received better information about the machinery than the artists.
- A computer classroom for the creation and printing of 3D works;
The room contains a number of computers and a printer. The MA students informed the Review Team that the University provides free open-source software for the students to use. The use of this room was due to change in the reorganisation (see below).
- A small library dedicated to the subjects related to the fine art programme.
The library is stocked with over 9,000 specialist art and architecture books and subscription to 5 specialist periodicals, with the possibility to add 300 new books annually. At the meeting with the MA students and the Alumni¹³³ the Review Team received several complaints regarding the library being too small, that it does not have adequate study spaces especially necessary if they are not allowed to take books out to read, and it does not have an adequate classification system. We endorse that access to the library and its study and reading spaces will be addressed in the Dean's forthcoming space reconfiguration (see below). We recommend that to support the new

¹³⁰ SER p. 22

¹³¹ Meeting 3 with BA students

¹³² Meetings 3 and 4 with BA and MA students respectively

¹³³ Meetings 4 & 5 with MA students and Alumni respectively

study programme that reading stock including e-books on art in Public Space needs to be increased and should reflect the wider international discourse in the field.

The FUA does have a photography studio, however, due to the Faculty being in the process of reorganising spaces, including the creation of a 'White box' space and a 'Black Box' space, it was not possible to access the photography workshop/ laboratory.

All the workshop resources were supported by a specialist technician and a librarian and the material available in these spaces is sufficiently adequate to the student needs in a professional environment, which seems to be updated periodically.

The Review Team was informed by the Dean¹³⁴ and during the tour in discussion with the technical/support staff, that there was to be a major reconfiguring of the workshop-spaces starting in the coming year. In light of the observations made by the Review Team on the workspaces, this will be a good opportunity to remedy these critical issues.

5.2 Financial Resources

Standard: the institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the programme

At the meeting with the Dean¹³⁵ he informed the Review Team that an annual discussion took place with the University to agree the yearly budget "*What worked in the past? What new measures need support?*" The Faculty independently manages the resources allocated to it from the TUL budget and the resources obtained from its own activities. The core source of the Faculty's finances is the contribution from the state budget, subsidies from the state budget and other income according to the provisions of Section 18 (2) of the Act and Article 6 of the TUL Management Rules.¹³⁶ The distribution of the funds allocated by the University, based on proposals made by the Dean, are approved and checked by the Faculty Senate. The Head of the Art Department is responsible to the Dean for the management and efficient use of the funds allocated for its study programmes.

Additional to this core funding there are other grant and project funding sources available that can be used for purchasing equipment for new programme developments and the Review Team was informed that the Faculty had been awarded nearly 6m CZK to invest in new course equipment by the Ministry. Similarly, the Faculty has successfully been able to appoint new teaching staff with the appropriate expertise for the new *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* study programme.

At the meetings¹³⁷ with teaching, technical and administrative staff, the Review Team were informed that TUL provides a sufficient budget for the maintenance and improvement of the workshops, often with the provision of extraordinary budgets obtained through European funding. It also learned that there was an adequate administrative structure available for the management of finance and resources.

5.3 Support staff

Standard: the programme has sufficient qualified support staff

¹³⁴ Meeting 1 with the Dean

¹³⁵ Meeting 1 with the Dean

¹³⁶ SER p.23

¹³⁷ Meetings 7 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, Instructors -MA; Meeting 8 with Technical staff; and Meeting 10 with Administrative Staff

Through its meetings¹³⁸ during the site visit, it became clear to the Review Team that although there are appropriate qualified support staff (technical, administrative, non-teaching staff, etc.) to support the learning and teaching, and artistic activities of the study programmes, there are some gaps. The issue raised in the new study programme SER that *“At present, only one staff member for the whole faculty is designated for the operation and maintenance of workrooms. Assistants or students take care of the operational technical matters of the workrooms. There is not enough qualified technical staff to take care of workshops and production in ateliers,”*¹³⁹ and through the experience of visiting the workshops, we advise that there are considerable Health and Safety issues, that need to be urgently addressed. Similarly, that the Faculty only has one *“internal person who takes care of IT matters, everything else is provided either by some teachers or externally”*.¹⁴⁰ could be very problematic if that person is not available (holiday, illness etc.).

The Review Team strongly supports the *RoLiZ - Human Resources Development* project at the TUL, which is part of new policies and practices in place for continuing professional development of all staff. That the University has now asked the faculties to develop their own staff development training programme to meet their own specific needs is also seen by the Review Team as a very positive move.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 5

Comment

10. Based on the number of students proposed for the new study programme the amount of space available is sufficient to deliver the programme;

Commendations

13. The new Dean’s plan to review space usage and proposed changes to rationalise workshop and library spaces;
14. The Faculty has been awarded nearly 6m CZK to invest in new course equipment (from the Ministry).

Recommendations:

15. The Atelier management could usefully reflect on the ethos of off-site working in the new programme and how the studio space will operate;
16. Health and Safety needs urgent attention in workshops and currently presents a real risk to the students and staff, and also in relation to Health and Safety the staffing of workshops should be addressed by the Dean in a forward-looking staffing plan;
17. To support the new study programme that Reading stock including e-books on art in Public space needs to be increased and should reflect the wider international discourse in the field.

The Review Team find that FUA TUL would be overall **substantially compliant** in Standard 5 for the new study programme, *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* (see Section 9 for compliance of 5.1 and 5.2).

¹³⁸ Meetings 7 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, Instructors -MA; Meeting 8 with Technical staff; and Meeting 10 with Administrative Staff

¹³⁹ SER p.24

¹⁴⁰ SER p.24

6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

6.1 Internal communication process

Standard: effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme

The SER states that “communication is often the core of the problem, at our university [...] The tools for arranging teaching are fragmented and diversified in e-mail communication, communication via facebook, eventually the IS / STAG information system and notifications physically hanging somewhere in the school”.¹⁴¹ “... Communication between the heads of the atelier and the teachers of other subjects is not organised in any way, and so many problems arise”.¹⁴²

The Review Team learned, that a new digital screen has been installed in the studio for digital posters, for example to advertise events and external lectures. In our discussion with Heads of Ateliers and teachers it was acknowledged, that problems with formal ways of communicating exist. It was said however that informal communication is not a problem. Students confirmed in their meetings with the Review Team that communication is a “big issue,”¹⁴³ for example, the information about changes in the direction of the Faculty was not very good. Although they have representatives in the Student Association and they attend monthly meetings with the Dean, students say that they had little participation in the transformation of the two current programmes into the proposed new programme. This does not mean that they do not welcome the changes proposed.

Also, the professional field shared in their meeting¹⁴⁴, that the Faculty doesn’t communicate very well with their organisations; it is a rather random process that happens when something is required (see also Standard 8.2)

On the other hand, a wide range of regular meetings happen throughout the semester.

- *Meetings of the management and individual workplaces take place regularly, sometimes together with students.*
- *Twice a semester there is a meeting of the heads of ateliers and students, where students submit to criticism their previous semester work.*
- *Department staff meets once a fortnight at the department.*¹⁴⁵
- *The faculty management members - the Dean, Vice-Deans, and Heads of Departments - meet for regular meetings every third Tuesday of the month.*
- *The all-faculty meeting with the Dean takes place once a semester.*
- *The Dean meets informally with students every first Monday of the month.*¹⁴⁶
- *Departments and studios meet every 3 weeks (without minutes).*

The Review Team learned during its meetings that the regular meeting of the Dean with students every first Monday of the month has no specific agenda. It is meant to create a pro-active atmosphere and it is kept informal and personal. In addition, the students have the opportunity to register critique through an online forum, however we did not hear that many students make use of it. Instead students and teachers of an atelier meet at the beginning of each semester, where students can bring in their ideas.

Like many other smaller higher art education institutions FUA TUL has developed an elaborate system of informal meetings, to take advantage of the direct contact between staff and students and among staff. This is often believed to be effective and direct. It bears however the danger, that some students might be left out of the loop (see also Standard 7). A refined internal communication process, such as the already initiated new portal and use of email and social media,

¹⁴¹ SER p.26

¹⁴² SER p.26

¹⁴³ Meetings 3 with BA students

¹⁴⁴ Meeting 12 with Professional Stakeholders/Employers

¹⁴⁵ SER p.26

¹⁴⁶ SER p.25

will ensure that all students and staff have the information they need to get the best out of the programme at any time, e.g. information on events. Additionally, the principle outline of the programme and how it is delivered, should be included in a published study handbook (see also Standard 2 recommendation).

Informal meetings do not always need minutes, this however makes it difficult to ensure, that all feedback gathered from students can and will be reacted upon, so feedback loops need to be efficiently used.

6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes

Standard: the programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and decision-making processes

The SER makes clear, that *“the Academic Senate of the Faculty is its main self-governing representative academic body. It has at least nine members, of which at least one third and at most one half are students. The members of the Academic Senate of the Faculty are elected from among the members of the Academic Community of the Faculty”*.¹⁴⁷ The Review Team learned¹⁴⁸ that some comments were made by the students about the new programme in a senate meeting in May (see also standard (2.1). The notion of ‘public space’ and how its definitions are wide-ranges was discussed, but in the end the students agreed that the proposed new programme is a good idea. At TUL *“each department has its head who is responsible for its operation. The Department of Art and Architecture (sic) is further divided into individual studios, which also have their own head and assistant”*.¹⁴⁹ In this way the studios (ateliers) mirror university departments in authority and responsibility, by deciding on *“the distribution of the department's finances, the redistribution of money, and its basic direction”*.¹⁵⁰ The SER states that the Head of the Atelier is primarily responsible to the students and his field of activity. He also has *“the final say in the assessment of students in his atelier”*.¹⁵¹

The Review team learned about the decision-making processes which ranges from internal discussions to approval of developments by the Senate and the Art and Scientific Council on major issues, such as bringing the new programme up for accreditation. The Review Team also had access to a sample of the Annual Management Report (2017)¹⁵²

Comments, commendations, and recommendations for improvement for Standard 6

Commendations

15. The already initiated improvements, e.g. new portal development, regular meeting of Dean with students, use of e-mail and social media.

Recommendations

18. Refine internal communication processes much further to ensure that all students and staff have the information they need to get the best out of the programme at any time;
19. In the light of the Review Team’s Recommendation on Standard 1 (internal quality assurance based on qualitative and quantitative measures) we recommend that this is based on an enhanced decision-making process involving staff, students, alumni and external stakeholders.

The Review Team finds that FUA TUL would be overall **partially compliant** in Standard 6 for the new study programme, *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* (see Section 9 for compliance of 6.1 and 6.2).

¹⁴⁷ SER p.25

¹⁴⁸ Meeting 13 with representatives from Faculty Senate (including students) and AUF Student Association

¹⁴⁹ SER p.26

¹⁵⁰ SER p.26

¹⁵¹ SER p.26

¹⁵² Annex 17

7. Internal Quality Culture

Standard: the programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures

Within the University and FUA, the Programme Guarantor is the person designated with the responsibility for monitoring and ensuring the quality of a study programme. They are responsible for preparing a QA evaluation report every five years, with an annual update, which is submitted to the Dean. The report content and areas to be addressed and evaluated are clearly stated on the TUL website in the *Rules of the Quality Assurance and internal Quality Evaluation System of the Technical University of Liberec*.¹⁵³ What the Review Team noted was that there appeared to be no guidance on the benchmark (level (%)) required against these criteria to signify the quality and level of achievement of the programme.

For the accreditation of a new programme a proposal would be scrutinised by Senate before going to the FUA Art and Scientific Council, which comprises of pedagogical staff and external experts, before being sent to the Council for Internal Evaluation of the Technical University of Liberec (RVH TUL), which acts independently in relation to the TUL activities and units that are being evaluated. The Council then assesses the proposal and makes a judgement identifying strengths and areas to be addressed (see also Standard 2.1).

During our meetings with the FUA Guarantors¹⁵⁴ it became clear to the Review Team that there was not a clear understanding of this 'quality' role, what were the expectations and what the process entails – *"As guarantors we have not been informed or asked about the evaluation standards"*.¹⁵⁵

At the meeting with the 'Quality Assurance Co-ordinator or equivalent', the Review Team was informed that there was no one individual or office within the Faculty with the responsibility for having an overview of the quality of the programmes and that it was the Dean that takes on this responsibility through his regular meetings with the staff and informal meetings with students.

In the SER¹⁵⁶ it states that at FUA a study programme is developed following these procedures:

- *a self-evaluation of the study plan;*
- *each semester there should be an evaluation of the students' work in studios by committees composed of selected leaders of the studios and experts from practice. Feedback is also provided to the heads of individual ateliers;*
- *Student questionnaire evaluating teaching in individual subjects is provided. The results should be reflected in the innovation of individual subjects;*
- *a pedagogical conference could be organized at which the concept of teaching will be confronted with the knowledge and experience of the faculty teachers.*

The Faculty does implement good quality assurance, enhancement processes such as:

- student evaluation questionnaires on the quality of their courses and teachers, which are available on *IS/STAG*, a digital archive;
- holding monthly informal student meetings with the Dean;
- having a range of informal contacts with the professional field;
- making good informal links with their alumni.

Currently the Faculty relies on external/national data on the employment status or current occupations of its students, but we were informed that the University and Faculty is looking for ways to better obtain this information.

¹⁵³ Annex 6 Rules of the Quality Assurance and internal Quality Evaluation System of the Technical University of Liberec, 13.11.17

¹⁵⁴ Meetings 2 & 11 with Programme Guarantors

¹⁵⁵ Meeting 11 with FUA Quality Assurance Coordinator

¹⁵⁶ SER p.28

The Review Team found little evidence where this 'quality' data was analysed and used to make changes leading to improvement, and through our meetings with the students¹⁵⁷, we understand that there is little feedback on the outcomes of the consultative processes to inform students of the changes made (see also Standard 6.1). Both the alumni¹⁵⁸ and the employers¹⁵⁹ were very positive about the quality of the students and the appropriateness of the study programmes, especially the new study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*, but both thought they could contribute more to improve the quality of the courses and the skill base of the students and both expressed their keenness to work more closely with the Faculty. Neither had played an active role in the development of the new study programme or read or contributed to the production of the SER.

The University has a comprehensive Staff Development policy and programme and has asked the faculties to develop appropriate courses to meet their needs.

From its meetings with all stakeholders and the documents presented, the Review Team believes that the study programme and the Faculty appears to think that quality assurance is an external process and that *"The standards are guaranteed by a commission"*.¹⁶⁰

In this transition period with the introduction of the new Dean, reorganisation of the management structure and Departments and the new staff appointed, the Review Team is confident that there is a strong will and intention to address these quality issues and develop an enhancement-led quality culture.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 7

Recommendations:

20. To build on the close, supportive community culture of the Faculty and further the establishment of a quality culture the Review Team recommends the Faculty attends to three matters:

- develops an internal quality assurance and enhancement process, aligned to the University's, which has clear qualitative and quantitative measures and sets the required benchmarks (% levels) of achievement to measure the success of the programmes;
- introduces more formal processes to involve the alumni and the employers in the enhancement process;
- introduces more formal processes (e.g. minutes of meetings) to ensure feedback to students on the outcomes of consultative meetings and surveys.

The Review Team find that FUA TUL would be overall **partially compliant** in Standard 7 for the new study programme, *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*.

¹⁵⁷ Meetings 3 & 4 with BA and MA students respectively

¹⁵⁸ Meeting 5 with the Alumni

¹⁵⁹ Meeting 12 with Professional Stakeholders/Employers

¹⁶⁰ Meeting 11 with FUA Quality Assurance Coordinator

8. Public interaction

8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts

Standard: the programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts

The Review Team read that as part of the preparation for the new study programme FUA is currently *“planning to open a studio for which students from the Department of Art could apply and where specific problems in the city of Liberec could be discussed. The result would be projects implemented to enter this public space with specific solutions, which would lead, for example, to an improvement of living conditions”*.¹⁶¹ The Review Team heard¹⁶² that the Programme Guarantor wishes to establish more collaborations between the department and external organisations, and the Review Team advises that such external activities should be, as far as possible, related to the strategies of the city or the region and should be based upon clear cooperation policies. The Review Team also values FUA’s aspirations to develop closer links and connections with social groups/ local communities in the new study programme, and notes that these should be circumscribed by ethical processes and procedures.

The Review Team noted the statement in the SER that *“as a part of the faculty’s strategy, there is a general trend to use knowledge and technology based on global knowledge, but to apply it locally. The priority effort is to operate directly in the city”*.¹⁶³ The Review Team acknowledges that while the new study programme will be unique in the Czech Republic, nonetheless, in order to succeed in this endeavour, FUA should make an analysis of appropriate benchmarking in relation to similar study programmes beyond the Czech Republic, in Europe or in the international arena, in order to remain ‘current’. For example, terms such as ‘Public Sphere’ and ‘Public Realm’ need to be clarified in order to arrive at a clear definition of the objectives and scope of the new study programme, with research, development and realisation of projects oriented to the ‘real world’ and participatory practices rather than the studio. The Review Team understand that the new teacher who delivers critical theory and practice in public space will address these complexities. The Review Team appreciates the involvement of lectures/profession from outside of the University (see also Standard 2.3).

The Review Team notes that the Faculty Strategy includes the following: *“support for creative artistic achievements of academic staff and faculty students via internal grants; support of presentation of architectural, artistic and design activities and realizations within national and international shows (Rooms, Designblok, student competitions, etc.)”; and “implementing design proposals in public areas”*.¹⁶⁴ In order for graduates of the new study programme to advance society through the use of their knowledge and skills, the Review Team acknowledges that the students develop technical skills across a range of art forms and media in the current programmes. We heard that ‘ethical’ considerations are already discussed, and that process-led practice is and will be supported¹⁶⁵. Both the Alumni and the Professional Field representatives stated there is a need to develop the students’ ‘business and professional’ skills (see also Standard 2.1).

8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions

Standard: the programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions

¹⁶¹ SER p.29

¹⁶² Meeting 6 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, Instructors - BA

¹⁶³ SER p.29

¹⁶⁴ SER p.29

¹⁶⁵ Meeting 7 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, Instructors - MA

The Review Team heard¹⁶⁶ about workshops held at a city theatre, and were able to meet with two representatives of the Professional field¹⁶⁷, one from the *Galerie Lázně* and one from an architectural studio *The Mjök*. Both welcomed the proposed BA and MA study programmes, and voiced that there is a need to consider current issues regarding public space and to develop a positive link between artists and architects. We heard that *Mjök* will be willing to act as a broker to help prepare and develop connections between organisations and help to embrace all aspects of public space and the interaction with it, and the gallery is very willing to collaborate further with the new study programme in its context as a regional gallery. We learned that they already both host 3-5 student placements per academic year from the current programmes, and the Review Team commends these placements in the final year of the current BA, and understands that rules are being developed to support students in engaging with external organisations in the new study programmes (see also Standard 2.1).

The Review Team noted that both professional field representatives had concern that the Faculty doesn't communicate well with the professional field, and that it is a rather random process that only happens when something is required (see also Standard 6.1). We also heard that they were not consulted in the development of the curriculum for the new study programme. The Review Team did not meet any representatives from the city authorities. The Review Team strongly recommends that the FUA establishes an external professional advisory group for the new study programme (see also Standard 1), to include representatives from the city council and local authority as well as the professional field, and thereby link more formally to public and cultural policy in the city and region. This would also enable the programme to assess and monitor the on-going needs of the professional field.

The Review Team noted that an 'individualistic' orientation about the concept of creation in public space has existed, which can lead to the use of 'discretionary power between staff and students, in order to facilitate external and professional contacts. This was evident in the Review Team's meeting with the Alumni¹⁶⁸, who spoke about some students being 'favoured' by being granted professional contacts in the current study programmes. However, it is clear that a new attitude is in place in preparation for the new study programme, and staffing has changed. The Review Team endorses that 'personal' contacts should be supplemented by clearly defined cooperation protocols, even if an introduction to an external organisation or project is initialised by an individual member of teaching staff.

Lifelong Learning is mentioned early in the SER¹⁶⁹, but no further reference is made to its implementation in relation to the new study programme.

8.3 Information provided to the public

Standard: information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate

The FUA ensures that information from the current programmes is given to the public by means of a Yearbook, a copy of which the Review Team received, and through the general communication system of the TUL. Additionally, the Review Team read that *"some publications produced sporadically are available for sale publicly and a new multimedia web portal is being created that will better communicate in relationship worker-student-public"*.¹⁷⁰ The TUL also uses exhibitions as

¹⁶⁶ Meeting 7 with Heads of Ateliers, Lecturers, Instructors - MA

¹⁶⁷ Meeting 12 with Professional Stakeholders/Employers

¹⁶⁸ Meeting 5 with Alumni

¹⁶⁹ SER p.7

¹⁷⁰ SER p.30

a conduit to the public¹⁷¹, and the studios are open to the public for the “*Ještěd f kleci competition exhibition*”.¹⁷² The FUA strategy states that they are planning: “*publishing activities - continuing to support the academic staff and students’ publication outputs in the form of editorial grants. Active use of editorial and publishing outputs to promote the faculty in the eyes of both professional and lay public through participation in festivals and professional shows and competitions; and defining the needs and possibilities of creating the faculty’s digital archive, including documentation of faculty students and teachers’ works and using the efficient Cumulus Canto 30 database SW, acquired as part of the ‘Architecture Outside of the Centres’ project. This software enables efficient management and access to the FUA digital archive*”.¹⁷³ The programme is trying to ensure dissemination through activities with feeder schools and are discussing the “*possibility of giving lectures at high schools*”.¹⁷⁴ The information about the new study programme is not yet available on the website as it is not yet accredited, but the Review Team learned that the Czech Republic has a special newspaper which is published nationally, and in which it is mandatory to include all information about study programmes. The Review Team heard¹⁷⁵ that it is the responsibility of the Dean to check that information is correct before entering the public domain.

The SER states that “*a new position of PR manager has been recently created. The manager will help to spread the valuable outputs of the school to the public, manage communication, prepare online content and develop cooperation with the media*”.¹⁷⁶ It appears to the Review Team that this position will have a focus both on marketing and to disseminate the contents, perspectives and the ethics associated with the new study programme once it is accredited. The Review Team heard that there is an intention to dispel the bias of the previous Dean, who focussed mainly on promoting Architecture.

The Review Team found no evidence of Quality Assurance statistics or metrics being presented publicly.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 8

Comments

11. The Review Team appreciates the involvement of lectures/profession from outside of the university (which were also chosen by students).

Commendations

16. The aspiration to develop closer links and connections with social groups/ local communities in the new study programmes.

Recommendations:

21. When new collaborations between the Department and external organisations are established, such external activities would usefully be related to the strategies of the city or the region and based upon clear cooperation policies/agreements and/or protocols;
21. The Faculty should make an analysis of appropriate benchmarking in relation to similar study programmes beyond the Czech Republic, in Europe or in the international arena, in order to remain ‘current’;
22. An external professional advisory group (see also Standard 1), to include representatives from the city council and local authority as well as the Professional Field, would be of benefit to the study programme;

¹⁷¹ SER p.31

¹⁷² SER p.31

¹⁷³ SER pp.29-30

¹⁷⁴ SER p.31

¹⁷⁵ Meeting 10 with Administrative staff

¹⁷⁶ SER p.31

23. Qualitative and quantitative data should be published in an appropriate form.

The Review Team find that FUA TUL would be overall **partially compliant** in Standard 8 for the new study programme, *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* (see Section 9 for compliance of 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3).

9. Summary of the programme's compliance with EQ-Arts Standards

EQ-Arts Standards	Compliance: Fully – F Substantially - S Partially - P Not - N	Remarks
<i>Standard 1</i> The programme goals are clearly stated and reflect the institutional mission.	substantially compliant	Refer to recommendations 1-3
<i>Standard 2.1</i> The goals of the programme are achieved through the content and structure of the curriculum and its methods of delivery.	not-compliant	Refer to recommendations 4-7
<i>Standard 2.2</i> The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	substantially compliant	Refer to recommendations 8
<i>Standard 2.3</i> Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes	not-compliant	Refer to recommendations 9-11
<i>Standard 3.1</i> There are clear criteria for student admission, based on an assessment of their artistic/academic suitability for the programme.	fully compliant	
<i>Standard 3.2</i> The programme has mechanisms to formally monitor and review the progression, achievement and subsequent employability of its students.	fully compliant	
<i>Standard 4.1</i> Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/researchers.	fully compliant	
<i>Standard 4.2</i> There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programmes.	fully compliant	
<i>Standard 5.1</i> The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.	partially compliant	Refer to recommendations 15-17
<i>Standard 5.2</i> The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the study programmes.	fully compliant	
<i>Standard 5.3</i> The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	substantially compliant	Refer to recommendation 16

<i>Standard 6.1</i> Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.	partially compliant	Refer to recommendation 18
<i>Standard 6.2</i> The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and clear decision-making processes.	partially compliant	Refer to recommendation 19
<i>Standard 7</i> The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.	partially compliant	Refer to recommendation 20
<i>Standard 8.1</i> The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.	partially compliant	Refer to recommendations 21 and 22
<i>Standard 8.2</i> The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	partially compliant	Refer to recommendation 23
<i>Standard 8.3</i> Information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate.	substantially compliant	Refer to recommendation 24

10. Summary of strong points, recommendations and conditions

This section offers a summary of the institutional attributes which stand out as being strong relative to the EQ-Arts standards for programme review, as well as an outline of the areas in which potential for further development emerged.

List of commendations

1. The vision, mission and aims of the Technical University Liberec are clear and appropriate;
2. The rationale for the new study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space* that develops current practice into improved practice that is more focussed on creation in the social context, was strongly endorsed by key stakeholders, current students, teachers, alumni and professional stakeholders/employers, and it was clear there is the need for this new programme.
3. The new study programme title is distinctive in a national context and will provide a truer reflection of actual study objectives in the student learning experience, based in a multi-disciplinary learning environment;
4. The ambition of the new study programme at BA and MA;
5. The internships/placements in year 4 of the current programmes;
6. The regular lecture programme involving international speakers and the search for new collaborative partners for Erasmus, and other projects;
7. The continuous verbal formative assessment which is highly valued by current BA students.
8. The Faculty's good links to general education, especially to high schools (gymnasium) which specialise in preparing for proceeding to Higher Art education;
9. The teaching team for its engagement to support their best students, also beyond completion of the current programmes.
10. The allocation of a negotiated percentage of time for teachers that supports their own artistic practice/research;
11. The New Dean's support for paid sabbaticals for habilitation, and to complete research projects and his review of the way RUV funding is distributed, and the aim to support new researchers;
12. The Practice Presentations by teachers, which helps current students to envisage potential career paths;
13. The new Dean's plan to review space usage and proposed changes to rationalise workshop and library spaces;
14. The Faculty's award of nearly 6m CZK to invest in new course equipment (from the Ministry).
15. The already initiated improvements, e.g. new portal development, regular meeting of Dean with students, use of e-mail and social media;
16. The aspiration to develop closer links and connections with social groups/ local communities in the new study programme;

Recommendations for further development

1. The Faculty takes this opportunity, to align the new study programme to related advanced developments in the field within an International context, for example using staff mobility;
2. The Faculty would benefit from defining their qualitative and quantitative measures used to ensure quality and standards of the new programme in line with the University's processes, as part of developing an internal quality process (see Standard 7), in addition to the rich and informative informal communication between students and academic staff;
3. The new FUA Strategic Plan would be enhanced by developing an action points and regular evaluation of progress within the Faculty;
4. In order to support the spirit of renewal and enhancement currently underway, and once the new study programme is running the Review Team advises that the Faculty should take the opportunity, through its internal quality process, to regularly review the programme curriculum to reflect upon the content and structure (subject to Ministry accreditation regulations). Also, to check that it is delivering its aims and objectives and providing a coherent learning experience and that students are not being over assessed;
5. Programme Learning Outcomes need to be written and clearly stated for the new BA and MA study programme and mapped to relevant subject benchmarking statements;
6. The Faculty should use the opportunity, that the new PhD programme affords, to establish an understanding of research (specifically artistic research) at all levels of the new study programme and that an introduction to a methodological

approach to research is considered as a compulsory part of the master curriculum (subject to Ministry accreditation regulations);

7. Consideration of how to better inform students of employment opportunities and prepare them for the world of work at both BA and MA;
8. International perspectives could be better embedded in the new study programme curriculum, e.g. in learning outcomes at BA and MA;
9. Assessment criteria need to be agreed and clearly stated and aligned to the programme learning outcomes, when written, for BA and MA;
10. Written feedback for final (summative) assessments should be introduced for the new study programme at key points in the students' study period;
11. Students would benefit if Learning outcomes, assessment criteria, and information on exam regulations could be published in a student handbook for both BA and MA, along with the content of the current study guides.
12. The Review Team found that the application process was fair and fit for its purpose. However, we advise that progress needs to be made in developing a clear notion of skills and attributes in relation to the aims and learning outcomes of the new programme and that the planned new information material for the intake of 2021 is seen as an opportunity to clarify and publish what the Faculty is looking for in an applicant and what professional practice the programme is preparing for;
13. The Faculty would benefit from developing a formal way to capture and analyse progress for alumni in their career paths in order to align with University's strategy for enhancement of the programme;
14. The Faculty considers ways for the alumni to contribute to the new programme;
15. The Atelier management could usefully reflect on the ethos of off-site working in the new programme and how the studio space will operate;
16. Health and Safety needs urgent attention in workshops and currently presents a real risk to the students and staff, and also in relation to Health and Safety the staffing of workshops should be addressed by the Dean in a forward-looking staffing plan;
17. To support the new study programme that Reading stock including e-books on art in Public space needs to be increased and should reflect the wider international discourse in the field.
18. Refine internal communication processes much further to ensure that all students and staff have the information they need to get the best out of the programme at any time;
19. In the light of the Review Team's Recommendation on Standard 1 (internal quality assurance based on qualitative and quantitative measures) we recommend that this is based on an enhanced decision-making process involving staff, students, alumni and external stakeholders.
20. To build on the close, supportive community culture of the Faculty and further the establishment of a quality culture the Review Team recommends the Faculty attends to three matters:
 - develops an internal quality assurance and enhancement process, aligned to the University's, which has clear qualitative and quantitative measures and sets the required benchmarks [% levels] of achievement to measure the success of the programmes;
 - introduces more formal processes to involve the alumni and the employers in the enhancement process;
 - introduces more formal processes (e.g. minutes of meetings) to ensure feedback to students on the outcomes of consultative meetings and surveys.
21. When new collaborations between the Department and external organisations are established, such external activities would usefully be related to the strategies of the city or the region and based upon clear cooperation policies/agreements and/or protocols;
22. The Faculty should make an analysis of appropriate benchmarking in relation to similar study programmes beyond the Czech Republic, in Europe or in the international arena, in order to remain 'current';
23. An external professional advisory group, to include representatives from the city council and local authority as well as the Professional Field, would be of benefit to the study programme;
24. Qualitative and quantitative data should be published in an appropriate form.

11. Conclusion

In preparing this enhancement report the EQ-Arts Review team has, as agreed with the senior management of the Faculty of Arts and Architecture (FUA) prior to the visit, reviewed a study programme that has not yet been accredited but exists as a proposal, by reviewing both the documentation provided, and current educational processes, procedures and contexts currently in place in FUA, to arrive at conjectural evaluations against the EQ-Arts Standards, which are aligned to European Standards and Guidelines (ESG). We appreciate the honesty and openness with which the Self-Evaluation Report was written, and the valuable contributions made in all our meetings by the representatives of FUA, the wider Technical University Liberec (TUL), and the professional field. The Review Team endorses the recently renewed direction of FUA in establishing the new Department of Art (by combining the former Department of Fine Arts and the Department of Environmental Design), and by merging the two existing study programmes, *Visual Communication* and *Digital Media and Environmental Design*, to develop a new study programme *Fine Art – Creation in Public Space*, at BA and MA. We applaud the opportunities for increased interaction with the locality that the new study programme will necessitate, such as: deeper engagement with the city authorities in addressing social and cultural challenges; working alongside the inhabitants of Liberec through participatory arts practices and methods; as well as further involvement with the professional field through placements, start-ups, public space initiatives, exhibitions, workshops etc. With well-designed professional skills content emphasised and delivered in the curriculum, we envisage that the new study programme will become a valuable educational and social catalyst with dynamic outcomes for students, staff and communities within the region. It will be important to connect to a wider international context as the new study programme gains traction within the Higher Education Arts sector in the Czech Republic, and to ensure that the work of staff and students is informed by critical thinking and making, through practice and research in the field of public arts globally. The promising research environment of FUA, and the Fine Art PhD programme, should be central to the future distinctive direction of *Fine Art – Creation in Public Space*.

It is clear to the Review Team that there remains time for significant planning before the new study programme commences in 2021, during which period consideration may be given to our recommendations and advice. We believe that the most pressing recommendation of mapping Programme Learning Outcomes to relevant subject benchmarking statements, and devising appropriate assessment criteria, can be achieved through carefully implemented staff development activities, that support teachers' pedagogical skills. Teachers will be further supported during a period of change via the forthcoming staff appraisal scheme. The implementation of a more transparent approach to Faculty management by the new Dean provides a positive milieu in which attention should be given to designing internal quality assurance processes that will ensure standards and lead to ongoing enhancement in the delivery of the new study programme, and guarantee that the curriculum remains fit for purpose and relevant. The Review Team consider that the involvement of students, alumni and the professional field in quality assurance, enhancement and decision-making should be embedded from the outset.

The Review Team are confident that work already underway to improve communications within the Faculty will be productive, and that the introduction of a fully comprehensive student handbook will empower future students entering the new study programme *Fine Art – Creation in Public Space*. We welcome the reorganisation and restructuring of the learning resources (studios, library and workshops) and associated capital investment. We do, however, note the seriousness of some health and safety matters that need to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

The EQ-Arts Review Team believes that, with the proposed staffing policy carefully aligned to the strategic direction of the Department of Art, and with the strong vision and leadership across FUA, the potential exists for the successful implementation of the new study programme *Fine Art - Creation in Public Space*.

Annex 1 – List of supporting documents

In addition to the Self-evaluation Report (SER) the Review Team received the following documents:

Annex 1. Link to Important University Documents in English

Annex 2. Statutes of the Technical University Liberec as of 13.08.18

Annex 3. The Study and Exam Regulations of the Technical University Liberec as of 13.08.18 (English version)

Annex 4. Disciplinary Code for Students of the Technical University of Liberec as of 03.01.17 (English version)

Annex 5. The Scholarship Regulations of the Technical University of Liberec as of 03.03.17 (English version)

Annex 6. Rules of the Quality Assurance and Internal Quality Evaluation System of the TUL as of 13.11.17 (English version)

Annex 7. Ethics Code for Technical University Liberec Employees and Students (English version)

Annex 8. Internal Wage Regulation Technical University of Liberec as of 20.12.17 (English version)

Annex 9. Rules of the Tender Procedures for Appointing Academic and other staff at TUL (English version)

Annex 10. Conditions of Employment Technical University of Liberec (English version)

Annex 11. The protection of intellectual property at the TUL and the commercialization of R&D results (English version)

Annex 12. The TUL Strategic Development Plan for 2020 with a forward view to 2030 (English version)

Annex 13. Strategic Plan for the Scholarly Research and other Creative Activities of TUL 2016-2020

Annex 14. Link to Organisation of the Education System and of its Structure -Eurydice

Annex 15. Eurydice National Qualifications Framework

Annex 16. Annual Activity Report Faculty of Arts and Architecture 2017 (English version)

Annex 17. Annual Management Report Faculty of Arts and Architecture 2017 (English version)

Annex 18. Application for accreditation of Bachelors Study Program Fine Art - Creation in Public (partially translated)

Annex 19. Application for accreditation of Masters Study Program Fine Art - Creation in Public (partially translated)

Annex 20. Handbook - Study Information (Czech Version)

Annex 21. Study Information 2019/2020 (Czech Version)

Annex 22. Study Plans 2019/2020 (translated to English)