



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Klaipėdos universiteto
DAILĖS PROGRAMOS (612W12001)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *FINE ARTS* (612W12001)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Klaipėda University

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader:

Prof. dr. h.c. John Butler

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Rugilė Ališauskaitė
Virginija Januškevičiūtė
Prof. dr. Atis Kampars
Prof. dr. Vojtěch Lahoda

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2013

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Dailė</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612W12001
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis	Dailė
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Dailės bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2004-06-07, ĮSAK - 852

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Fine Arts</i>
State code	612W12001
Study area	Art
Study field	Fine Arts
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Fine Arts
Date of registration of the study programme	2004-06-07, ĮSAK - 852

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

CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	3
I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS.....	5
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2. Curriculum design.....	6
3. Staff.....	7
4. Facilities and learning resources.....	9
5. Study process and student assessment.....	9
6. Programme management.....	13
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
IV. SUMMARY.....	17
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT.....	19

I. INTRODUCTION

In carrying out the review of the BA Fine Art course the Expert Team (the Team) were guided by the principles of objectivity, impartiality, respect for the participants of the evaluation process, confidentiality and cooperation.

The Team followed the criteria defined by the *Methodology for Conducting an Institutional Review in Higher Education in Lithuania* and other Lithuanian legal acts governing quality evaluation in higher education.

The Team visited Klaipeda University and the Arts Faculty on Tuesday 22nd October 2013 after they had carried out a rigorous analysis of the BA Fine Art Self Evaluation Report, the previous Accreditation Reports of 2008 and 2011 and the preparation of Preliminary Reports.

Following the subject review guidelines the study programme evaluation involved the examination of 6 areas: the aims and learning outcomes of the study programme; the curriculum design; teaching staff; facilities and learning resources; the study process and students' performance assessment and programme management.

The visit to the University and Faculty involved the Team meeting with the following groups:

1. the senior management & administrative staff
2. the SER preparatory team
3. the students
4. the teaching team
5. the alumni
6. the social partners

Site observations of the physical resources were conducted by the Team during the visit and the Team were also able to view art and final project work including the final thesis produced by the students.

Two members of the Team have been involved in previous review and accreditation exercises in 2008 and 2011 and they were able to note that the general organisation and level in Lithuanian higher art education has improved. This improvement was evident during the visit to Klaipeda in October.

The Team would like to thank the University and programme team for the generosity and hospitality shown to them and the openness and frankness presented throughout the day. The level of involvement by the students and staff they encountered during the visit greatly enhanced the efficiency of the work that was carried out and made for an enriching experience for all involved.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

1.1 Programme aims and learning outcomes are well defined, clear and publicly accessible

In the SER the programme's stated aim *"To develop mature and independent artists and educators, who are able to adequately assess the art processes happening in today's world and to actively participate as artists, ready to professionally educate young people and society"* is clear and concise and this aim is largely possible if the student achieves the well articulated learning outcomes. There is however inconsistency between this aim and in the general description of the programme within the SER, which places more emphasis 'regional tradition'.

1.2 Programme aims and learning outcomes are based on the academic and/or professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market

The Team clearly sees the need for such a programme within the region and wish to support its continued existence, but whilst it is important to stress the need and demand for skilled artists to remain in Lithuania Minor it is important that the students obtain the skills and knowledge to compete on a national and international level. Students must be encouraged to achieve this ambition. The SER places too much emphasis on meeting the region's needs with a danger that the programme becomes too provincial, disadvantaging the student's professional career as an artist. This is inconsistent to their overarching stated aim.

Key stake-holders including students, alumni and social partners have all stated they would like more professional skills developed to support the graduates when they leave the University and enter the labour market

1.3 Programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered

The Team believe that the programme aim and learning outcomes are consistent with the level of studies and the level of qualification offered.

1.4 The name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other.

The Team recommends the programme management and teaching staff reconsider the clarity of the programme title in relationship to its stated aims to make it clear to prospective students and the professional field what the mission is; both in relation to a programme placing emphasis on Painting as its major discipline within a interdisciplinary fine arts study programme and the possible polarity between 'regional tradition' and its claim for contemporary interdisciplinary practice. The Team recommend the Faculty should reconsider the emphasis the management place on the pedagogic element of the programme as the students and alumni are unanimous in stating this is the least popular and beneficial to their career development. This time/credits could be better used developing their practice and introducing more option modules.

The Team think the very recent development of merging the Department of Fine Arts into the new Department of Architecture, Design & Fine Arts is a positive move, which could facilitate greater interdisciplinary practice with cognate disciplines, more collaborative projects, electives and new teaching and learning strategies.

2. Curriculum design

2.1 the curriculum design meets legal requirements

The programme complies with national legal acts and regulations and to the General Requirements for undergraduate study programmes in Lithuania,

2.2 study subjects and/or modules are spread evenly; their themes are not repetitive; the content of the subjects and/or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies

The study subjects and modules are equitably spread across the years giving the students a balanced workload, but the Team recommends it would be better to use clearer, more descriptive titles to the modules instead of Painting I-VII, Sculpture I-II, Drawing I-VII, Composition I-VII and Art History I-IV etc. to help the students better understand the progression in learning rather than emphasis on process. The Team also believes this over emphasises teacher-led practice and notes the slow introduction of independent learning, which the Team thinks is too late to prepare the students for the professional world.

2.3 the content and methods of the subjects/modules are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes

The SER states the study programme results in students being able to “*Apply modern technologies and their methods in art and interdisciplinary projects. During one’s studies learn how to independently and professionally formulate one’s creative goals, choose proper means to implement them and be able to create works of fine arts (paintings) that would allow one to fully compete in the art market.*”, which only appears to be facilitated in their final year. The current curriculum and learning outcomes place great emphasis on the development of the practical skills required of a ‘painter’, which the Team sees as a narrow definition of a contemporary ‘painter’ artist and doesn’t facilitate what it claims the students are able to do.

As stated earlier, the programme’s emphasis on the pedagogical “know how” could be useful for teaching at elementary schools, however generally those, wishing to teach art, would still need to get certification from pedagogical faculty. Does it make sense to keep pedagogy as part of the curricula in this context? The Team supports the students and alumni view that it doesn’t, and this would give more time to independent working and interdisciplinary projects within the new faculty.

2.4 the scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes

The programme is very successful in developing student’s practical painting and observational skills, but the shift from teacher-led to more student-centred learning is slow in being introduced. Whilst the Team supports the development of the craft skills it believes students should take more responsibility for their learning earlier in the course and elements for independent learning, risk taking should happen earlier and with increasing credit value.

The Team is very positive about the students having the opportunity to study electives such as philosophy, psychology, foreign language etc. and the Team hopes the new Faculty will enable greater interdisciplinary projects.

2.5 the content of the programme reflects the latest achievements in science, art and technologies.

Similar to the lack of clarity of the programme's aims, stated in the previous section (1.4), the programme needs to address the course content to ensure it meets its learning objectives and prepares students for the professional world including:

- the use of digital technology for learning (e.learning tools – Moodle etc.);
- professional development skills (ie. Business, entrepreneurial and management skills);
- contemporary discourse in art and philosophy;
- digital software training;
- critical writing and research skills.

3. Staff

3.1 the study programme is provided by the staff meeting legal requirements

In accordance with the Law on Higher Education and Research of the Republic of Lithuania (No. XI-242), the order of the Minister of Education and Science Due to the approval of the description of the general requirements for the degree-awarding first cycle and integrated study programmes (No. V-501), and the description of the qualification requirements for scientists' and artists' positions and the order of the organisation of assessment and competitions to hold positions as well as the order of the awards of pedagogical titles at VAA approved by the Senate (26 May 2010) the staffing legal requirements for the study programme are met.

3.2 the qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes

The teachers have the appropriate qualifications to deliver the programme, but they are a relatively very small team of one Professor, two Associate Professors and a lecturer who have to cover a wide range of skills and competences and demonstrate a wide range of practices. These are complemented by four Associate Professors and four lecturers who deliver the general speciality basics and special education studies courses.

The permanent teachers have an average of 16 years teaching experience, but the Team believes it is critical that to achieve the required standards the right specialist teachers should be teaching the appropriate programme elements and notes the programme should reconsider who is delivering and supervising the final dissertation.

3.3 the number of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure learning outcomes

As stated in 3.2 the Fine Art programme team is small but they are very much appreciated by the students and alumni who all felt they are very dedicated to and highly motivated by the programme. The Team concur with this view, but also agree with the students and alumni view that a more varied teaching input is necessary through visiting tutors (national and international).

The Team is very positive with the University's new resources to support staff research and professional development, but is also concerned that this action isn't neutralised by the statement (SER Staff section) that there has been a noticeable increase in staff workload due to a decrease in funding for salaries and an increase in teaching to 930 hours. This action, the staff claim, reduces their scientific and artistic activities. The Team does note that the ratio of students to staff is manageable and equivalent to many European Higher Arts Education institutions.

3.4 teaching staff turnover is able to ensure an adequate provision of the programme

The teaching staff turnover is very low in the programme with the newest member joining five years ago, but the team does understand this is due to the current financial and the reduction of general education funding, the decrease in student numbers and the decrease in funds for salaries.

The University's recruitment strategy is very thorough and does ensure the new staff have the appropriate qualifications and qualities required, but with no new staff this hasn't help develop the programme.

The Team does think the Faculty has to find ways to compensate for this and hopefully the new faculty structure will enable greater crossover of teaching. It also needs to introduce succession planning.

3.5 the higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme

In addition to the University's new resources to support staff research and professional development, it also supports staff development through:

- 1) developing their creative arts practice as role models for students
- 2) teachers prepare the modules of their taught subjects, accumulate methodological materials.
- 3) participating in conferences and creative workshops.
- 4) participating in international exchange and similar study programmes with foreign schools.

The Team believe the Faculty should provide staff development to develop the teaching staff's learning and teaching strategies and methods to help them engage in new methodologies involving digital technology tools and e-learning.

The teaching team very rarely participate in international visits or teacher exchange for two main reasons a) the lack of University funding support for travel and b) the limited foreign language capacity of the staff, but this has a impact on staff development and developing new learning and teaching strategies.

3.6 the teaching staff of the programme is involved in research (art) directly related to the study programme being reviewed.

All the teaching staff are practicing artists exhibiting nationally and internationally to an appropriate level.

4. Facilities and learning resources

4.1 the premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality

The Team congratulates the Faculty and University on the noticeable improvement in buildings and the learning and teaching resources since the last review.

However it would benefit the ambition and quality of the student's work if they could have more studio space for their practice. When viewing the work there appears to be a limitation on scale and ambition of the work produced.

The team is also concerned that the final year studios are located at KCCC 2 km from the Arts Faculty, which with such small cohorts diminishes the peer learning process.

4.2 the teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are adequate both in size and quality

The Team found that there has been good development in the Faculty's IT learning and teaching resources, but the use of them should be better embedded into the programme. Both studio staff and students need to make better use of them as teaching and learning tools.

4.3 the higher education institution has adequate arrangements for students' practice

The Team believes there is adequate provision for the programme to achieve its learning objectives and it supports this with good connections with external agencies such as the KCCC gallery and workshops, which present international exhibitions and offer artist residencies and public workshops.

4.4 teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible.

The programme uses the Central Klaipėda University library for the scientific and methodological studies literature. The students of the department use a computer database in the computer room, located in the Klaipėda City Simonaitytė library, with which the University has a cooperation agreement. The Arts Library in the Faculty of Arts, which was founded in 1971, is used for theoretical studies in the reading-room, with 30 working places and one computer workplace. These resources are good and fit for purpose. The programme has the teaching resources (books etc.) but it needs to provide better orientation and skills development to utilise them properly.

The alumni commented that they often relied on teachers to bring in their own computers and wished that there was more use of IT in the programme

5. Study process and student assessment

5.1 the admission requirements are well-founded.

The Team fully supports the BA teaching team's concern regarding the negative impact the National Admissions System is having on recruitment of the best and most appropriate students for this programme. It makes it very difficult for courses run outside the capital to compete at the same level and promotes a centralised strategy, which is not supportive for developing inclusive cultural strategies throughout the country. It is difficult for the Faculty but it must be competitive at a national and international level.

The impact of this National policy is extremely damaging and threatening to the programme with only 4 students recruited in 2011-12 and 2 students in 2012-13, which must question its future viability. The impact is not only financial but also for the study process as the level of peer learning is also critically diminished and offers little to show possible levels of achievement.

Recruitment has fallen dramatically since 2008 when a total of 41 students were enrolled down to 14 in 2012-13.

The Team does think that if the Faculty did clarify the title and aims of the programme it would also help with its recruitment.

The current students and alumni stated that the University needs to do more to market the BA course as they could be the threat to the course if they didn't recruit more – "nobody knows about it".

5.2 the organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

As stated earlier in this report 2.2-2.5 the Faculty needs to reconsider the programme content and embed these changes in the study process.

Current students all stated they 'loved' the programme and teachers, but the Team found little critical rigor in their discussion with us, we found it hard to find neither clear motivation nor ambition in their statements and there was no reference to contemporary discourse or theory.

All alumni agreed that they have not received enough opportunity to give feedback on the quality of their learning experience during studies, nor have been approached to help in developing the programme since graduating.

The programme has developed a teaching, learning and evaluation system to ensure that the students would acquire necessary subject knowledge, subject skills and abilities, as well as transferable skills.

While determining the frequency and consistency of exams and tests, the following factors are taken into account:

- a) the subject's priority in respect to the study programme;
- b) the completeness of the stated theoretical, methodological, and practical part of the subject's content, the relationship of the subject's content with the content of other subjects taught in other semester;
- c) the relationship of continuous learning (educational) subjects taught during a semester, during several semesters, and on a one semester scale;
- d) the optimum relationship of the tests and exams held at the end of the semester;
- e) the rationally planned students' load during the session.

The priorities of the study programme's study content and study methods:

- a) the programme content and study methods must meet the basic aims and goals of the study programme, that is, the most essential knowledge and skills that the graduate should acquire must be correctly and consistently acquired while

- purposefully and systematically studying the programme subjects that are connected by logical links and fully meet the basic aims and goals of the programme;
- b) the programme accessibility, openness (conditions for all persons having appropriate education and preparation to study this study programme should be made);
- c) the relevance of the programme (must meet the needs of today's society);
- d) the programme consistency and systemacity (it should be based on the principles of fundamental theoretical, methodological, and practical layout's consistency, and logical and systematic relationship between subjects' content)

As with the Learning Outcomes The Team found a very clear mapping of the learning process consistent with the level of studies and the level of qualification offered. These processes appear to be determined by the University and present good guidelines to the programme teams. The inconsistency the Team finds is between the content and objectives of the programmes modules and the aims of the programme.

5.3 students are encouraged to participate in research, artistic and applied research activities.

This is problematic for students when they given little opportunity for independent studies, which happens too late in their programme. They are encouraged to engage in external projects, competitions and exhibitions and they do so, but the teaching team do not accredit their engagement nor their output, which is not the best way to encourage such activities. This has been raised by previous Panels and the programme team should find ways to resolving this and building these activities into the curriculum and accrediting them.

5.4 students have opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes.

Students are given the opportunity to participate in international mobility programmes but in the Team's meeting with the students found little evidence of participating in them. With such low numbers in cohorts it will be problematic for teaching and peer learning if some of your numbers study abroad, unless they are replaced by incoming guest students.

Students do participate in ERASMUS and international programmes but in small numbers.

5.5 the higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support.

Academic support for student achievement and monitoring is performed through:

- 1) After exam discussion within the department during which the causes of good and bad results are analyzed and ways of eliminating them are considered;
- 2) Curators, who collect and analyse information concerning the students' learning characteristics during the semester, are assigned to every course;
- 3) Through monitoring semester performance observed during seminars, tests and individual classes teachers inform the head of the department about the students, who do not fulfill the formulated tasks;
- 4) Study process (attendance, interim testing results, student motivation) are regularly discussed at the department;

- 5) The Vice-Dean of studies and the Head of the Department search for ways of eliminating the causes of academic failure;
- 6) Each semester meetings with students discuss session results and the learning characteristics of a new semester;
- 7) Individual tutor discussions with students take place regularly;
- 8) During the semester contact with attending students is maintained by e-mail and phone.

Students comment that they are aware of these academic support services and the Team think this is a very thorough process, which is helped by the very small number of students.

In the University students are also provided with psychological, sports, health, and cultural support. The University and the Faculty of Arts implement: broad cultural activities including traditional festivals and events, student concerts and art projects; concessions are granted to students who visit Klaipeda Concert Hall, Klaipeda Musical theater events; the Exhibition Hall provides a free opportunity to attend exhibitions of works of art; an art shop provides a 5% discount for Department of Fine Arts students to buy necessary for artists materials.

Scholarships for full-time students are awarded according to the study regulations. Students can receive two types of scholarships: encouraging and social.

Klaipeda University has 3 dormitories.

5.6 the assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available.

In the SER it states "The descriptions of study subjects provide little information about the evaluation criteria and their links to learning outcomes. In subject unit cards there is no separate graph about the evaluation criteria, and students have relatively limited information about the evaluation procedures. To single out the evaluation criteria and apply them in order to increase efficiency of studies could be one of the programme improvement areas."

When asked by the Team the students said they had a clear understanding of the learning outcomes and were informed about them at the beginning of each semester. They understood the development process they would experience through the course. They all understood how the assessment criteria directly related to the Learning Outcomes and were satisfied with the assessment process and timetable. The assessment feedback was adequate and they understood their strengths and weaknesses as described by their teachers.

There is a clear contradiction in these two statements and further statements in the SER (4.1 p.42) express a lack of clarity between the learning outcomes, assessment criteria and the grading 10 point criteria and feeding back to the student, therefore the Team thinks this needs to be urgently clarified.

5.7 professional activities of the majority of graduates meets the programme providers' expectations.

The Team notes the programme's difficulties in 'tracking' graduate students and in only meeting five alumni it make it difficult for us to make a definitive comment on how course meets the providers' expectations, but it is important that the programme team

do give this due consideration through increasing dialogue with them and using their expertise. As stated earlier the alumni we met were positive about keeping in contact and providing feedback and advice.

6. Programme management

6.1 responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated.

The BA is managed by a Programme Committee consisting of three teachers from the programme who are responsible for the programme execution and they are complemented by the KU AF Vice-Dean who advises on the practice and curriculum adjustments. There is also a student member, which the Team supports as good practice, providing their perspective and wishes.

The Team noted in the SER (p.49) the programme states '*Students are partially involved in evaluating and improving the quality of studies*'..... '*However, there is a lack of students' initiative to ensure study quality*' and thinks the programme must strive to get greater student participation in the evaluation process.

6.2 information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed.

Students' contact data has been accumulated by the Department since 2007, when the first graduates finished their studies, data about students' drop out started in 2006 and a list of defended Bachelor topics and a list of works since 2007. The Department also records teacher and student mobility statistical data.

Each academic year the Department discusses the following during the meetings:

- 1) the study process aims of the year discussed (in August);
- 2) Study process organization (in August);
- 3) Preliminary themes and supervisors of the final works (in October);
- 4) Assessment questions of study process quality (in November-May);
- 5) Examination session results (in January, June);
- 6) Academic year results (in June).

Every year study programme quality is self-evaluated by the programme team, who figure out, how the results of programme objectives are implemented, the level of student achievements. The quality of the programme is judged by student's external and internal responses to the task accomplishment, the questions raised, described observations, suggestions. In the questionnaire students are presented with inquiries about academic and social support quality, quality of studies, participation in the change process specifics. At the end of the academic year, using SWOT methodology Department teachers analyse study organisation's strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities. According to the received information, objectives and aims for the next year are formed.

The Team fully supports this process, but recommends the programme carries out a more systematic self-evaluation through closer consideration of its strengths (including distinctive features), weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The Team found a lot of repetition in the SER without stating what were its clear strengths (which the Team has found many) the weaknesses, threats or opportunities.

6.3 the outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme.

It is evident to the Team that the University has shown a worthy commitment to the programme by:

- the improvement of the resources since the last review in 2011 and the upgrading of the building facilities;
- the introduction of resources to support staff development;
- better Quality Assurance and Management processes
- better engagement with external stakeholders who are contributing positively to the programme.

There are still areas raised in the 2011 review that need further development such as the international dimension both in terms of student and staff mobility, which requires additional support by the University and in the curriculum with more focus on contemporary art discourse and philosophy. Although there has been some improvement in collaboration with external Stakeholders there is still room for considerable improvement.

6.4 the evaluation and improvement processes involve stakeholders.

Social partners (critiques, supervisors, exhibition directors, art schools directors, etc.) are invited to participate in reviews, the defense of thesis, students' work exhibitions. The programme has developed strong connections with some local arts organisations (Lyceum, KCCC and Roote Gallery), which are offering development opportunities to some students. The issue is that most stakeholders are 'local' and when asked how they compared the skills and quality of work of Klaipeda BA Fine Art students, to that of students from other Universities, they all said they were not aware of other institutions and the work produced – *"it was more important these artists were in the region"*. This is supported by the programme in the SER, which states *"participation of the social partners in the evaluation of the quality has given the fragmented results. The cooperation with the social partners is intended to develop not only academic-professional relationships, but also to expand students' socio-cultural horizons and increase their expertise"*.

The Team think it is important the programme does develop more links with stakeholders on a national and international level as it should be concerned how they compare in these arenas.

6.5 the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient.

The Team has noted a good development in Quality Assurance and Management processes and measures by the University but these need to be better embedded in the programme.

Programme administration and quality assurance processes are outlined in details in Klaipeda documents:

Study Regulations http://www.ku.lt/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/20101008_11_22.pdf);

Klaipėda University Statute (2010);

Description of University employees' duties, (written form 2008);

Regulation description of lecturers certification and competition to hold position (<http://www.ku.lt/ard/struktura/personalo-skyrius/konkursas-atestacija-pareigoms-uzimti/>).

From the beginning of the 2009-10 academic year new quality assurance methods have been introduced. The aim is to implement a curriculum assessment methodology, the principles of which are similar to the *'Tuning'* project, supported by the European Commission and the General Directorate of Culture and Education. The main quality control aims are: study quality management, study criteria matching the ECTS system, curriculum relevance, organization of studies control involving social partners, weighed general and subject-specific competences balance in study programmes.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Team recommends:

1. the programme management and teaching staff reconsider the clarity of the programme title in relationship to its stated aims to make it clear to prospective students and the professional field what the mission is; both in relation to a programme placing emphasis on Painting as its major discipline within a interdisciplinary fine arts study programme and the possible polarity between 'regional tradition' and its claim for contemporary interdisciplinary practice;
2. the Faculty should reconsider the emphasis the management place on the pedagogic element of the programme as the students and alumni are unanimous in stating this is the least popular and beneficial to their career development;
3. more professional skills are developed to support the graduates when they leave the University and enter the labour market;
4. it would be better to use clearer, more descriptive titles to the modules instead of Painting I-VII, Sculpture I-II, Drawing I-VII, Composition I-VII and Art History I-IV etc. to help the students better understand the progression in learning rather than emphasis on process.
5. the programme to address the course content to ensure it meets its learning objectives and prepares students for the professional world including:
 - the use of digital technology for learning (e.learning tools – Moodle etc.);
 - professional development skills (ie. Business, entrepreneurial and management skills);
 - contemporary discourse in art and philosophy;
 - digital software training;
 - critical writing and research skills.
6. students should take more responsibility for their learning earlier in the course with elements for independent learning and risk-taking;
7. the right specialist teachers should be teaching the appropriate programme elements and notes the programme should reconsider who is delivering and supervising the final dissertation.
8. a more varied teaching input is necessary through visiting tutors (national and international).

9. the Faculty to find ways to compensate for the low turnover of teaching staff and hopefully the new faculty structure will enable greater crossover of teaching. It also needs to introduce succession planning.
10. the Faculty provide staff development to develop the teaching staff's learning and teaching strategies and methods to help them engage in new methodologies involving digital technology tools and e-learning.
11. the students have more studio space for their practice.
12. the use of IT learning and teaching resources should be better embedded into the programme. Both studio staff and students need to make better use of them as teaching and learning tools.
13. VAA and the Faculty to continue to lobby the Ministry for change in the National Admissions System, to create equal opportunities within, and support inclusive cultural strategies throughout the country. This system makes it very difficult for the Faculty to be competitive at a national and international level. The Team is happy for the University to reference our support for the change.
14. the teaching team to continue to encourage and recognise the student's engagement in external projects, competitions and exhibitions, but accredit this engagement towards their final award.
15. the programme to ensure the students are clear about the links between the content and objectives of the programme's modules and the aims of the programme.
16. the Faculty and programme provides adequate resources to the 'tracking' of graduate students for 'expert' advice and recording 'employability'.
17. the programme must strive to get greater student participation in the evaluation process.
18. the programme carries out a more systematic self-evaluation through closer consideration of its strengths (including distinctive features), weaknesses, opportunities and threats.
19. further development such as the international dimension both in terms of student and staff mobility, which requires additional support by the University and in the curriculum with more focus on contemporary art discourse and philosophy.
20. there is still room for considerable improvement collaboration with external Stakeholders.
21. it is important the programme does develop more links with stakeholders on a national and international level as it should be concerned how they compare in these arenas.
22. Quality Assurance and Management processes and measures introduced by the University need to be better embedded in the programme.

IV. SUMMARY

Main positive and negative quality aspects of each programme evaluation area and main recommendations for the improving of quality of the study programme.

2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design meets legal requirements; study subjects and/or modules are spread evenly, their themes are not repetitive; the content of the subjects and/or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies, but there is a problem with pedagogical courses. Students think there are too many. Similar to the issues of clarity of the aims, the programme needs to address the content of its curriculum to assure it meets its learning objectives; these include:
digital tech for learning, professional development (business, skills, entr, mngmt)
contemporary discourse and philosophy, digital software training (transferrable skills).

3. Staff

4. Facilities and learning resources

5. Study process and student assessment

The Team fully support the programme's concerns regarding the national admission system and the negative effects it has on recruitment for the programme.

The Team recommend they continue lobbying the Ministry to change it and they can reference our support for this change.

The programme must clarify the title and aims – it will help with recruitment.

Reconsider the content (noted above): these changes should be embedded in the study process.

All alumni agreed that they have not received enough opportunity to give feedback on the quality of their learning experience during studies.

Students and teachers are missing the notion of individual studies.

Independent projects are not credited.

The programme management should work more to attract students to be more active and receptive to the programme.

Student mobility is very limited.

The panel appreciate to implement curriculum assessment methodology. However as far as there is lack of students' initiative to ensure study quality (SER, p. 39), the senior management should persuade students to be involved in the process of evaluation of teaching staff.

Social partners who provide crucial support for the programme's ... noted that the graduates have not, during the programme, received enough skills to remain active in the professional field.

6. Programme management

We appreciate their ongoing commitment to the programme – it's important in the region (social p, alumni - everyone speaks about how they sustain the tradition) The programme management should solve the problem of lack of specialist teachers (SER, p. 21). The decline of students is possibly connected with this situation.

The programme management is aware that the best teachers should apply for receiving pedagogical titles. Most talented teachers should be forced to do so.

The programme management should do more to secure teachers' travels abroad more often (e.g. agreements with similar Study programmes at the Universities abroad). There is lack direct communication between the senior management and the programme. Better use of input of the social stakeholders; should work more to receive input from a MUCH broader range of stakeholders. *The internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient.*

There's been good development in the university. It needs to be better embedded in the programme.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Fine Arts* (state code – 612W12001) at Klaipėda University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Staff	2
4.	Material resources	3
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	2
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	2
	Total:	13

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader:

Prof. dr. h.c. John Butler

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Rugilė Ališauskaitė

Virginija Januškevičiūtė

Prof. dr. Atis Kampars

Prof. dr. Vojtěch Lahoda