



Quality Enhancement Review Report

Programme review

Fine Arts and Design

Faculty of Art and Design at Jan Evangelista

Purkyně University in Usti nad Labem

UNIVERZITA J. E. PURKYNĚ V ÚSTÍ NAD LABEM



21 – 23 October 2019

Contents

- Introduction..... 3
- 1. Programme’s goals and context..... 9
- 2. Educational processes 14
 - 2.1 The curriculum and its methods of delivery 14
 - 2.2 International perspectives 19
 - 2.3 Assessment..... 22
- 3. Student profiles 24
 - 3.1 Admission/Entrance qualifications 24
 - 3.2 Student progression, achievement and employability 25
- 4. Teaching staff 27
 - 4.1 Staff qualifications and professional activity 28
 - 4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body 31
- 5. Facilities, resources and support..... 33
 - 5.1 Facilities 33
 - 5.2 Financial resources 36
 - 5.3 Support staff..... 37
- 6. Communication, organisation and decision-making 39
 - 6.1 Internal communication process 39
 - 6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes 42
- 7. Internal Quality Culture..... 44
- 8. Public interaction 50
 - 8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts 50
 - 8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions 51
 - 8.3 Information provided to the public..... 52
- 9. Summary of the programme(s)’ compliance with EQ-Arts Standards..... 54
- 10. Summary of strong points, recommendations and conditions 56
- 11. Conclusion 62
- Annex 1 – List of supporting documents 63

Introduction

- *Context of the review*

The Dean of the Faculty of Art and Design at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Usti nad Labem, Doc. Mgr. A. Pavel Mrkus, consulted EQ-Arts office with the aim of understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the Faculty during a period of revision and transformation, in response to national accreditation. This review was also set up and coordinated within a network of Art and Design Faculties in Czech Republic. The review, therefore, was undertaken with consideration of the forthcoming accreditation of the undergraduate Bachelor and doctoral programmes, which has now been submitted to the National Accreditation Bureau. For this reason, data and documents assessed could be seen as aspirational as not all processes are embodied in official structures yet. The Review Team took this approach into consideration and recommendations presented through this report are based on what was identified as current practice, highlighting where additional changes may be required to comply with the necessary standards at national and European levels. The specific focus of the review was in the Fine Arts Programmes.

The extensive amendment to the Higher Education Act in Czech Republic became applicable on 1st September 2017 and has resulted in a considerable number of changes, especially in terms of the organisation of studies including change of the accreditation authority, cancellation of courses of study without replacement, introduction of mandatory areas of study and internal quality evaluation procedures. The review undertaken follows the European Standards and Guidelines (2015), the Czech Standards and Guidelines and according to the EQ-Arts Principles and Standards In Quality Assurance and Enhancement¹ (QAE).

- *Data on the institution*

Faculty of Art and Design at J. E. Purkyně University in Usti nad Labem began its activities in 1992 with an art glass studio at the Department of Art Education at the Faculty of Education within the University. This was followed by the opening of a ceramics and porcelain studios in 1993 when the Institute of Art Culture was established. The Institute became the Faculty of Applied Art and Design in 2000 with a Digital Media studio opened in 2003. The Faculty's name was changed to Art and Design in 2004 with a Curatorial Studies Masters degree and Photography in English, opening in 2007 (later renamed Photography and Time-based Media Masters degree). A Visual Communication PhD programme was accredited in 2008.

The Faculty has recently undertaken a shifting process to two main programmes of study in Czech: Visual Arts and Design, and one main programme in English: Fine Arts². The Faculty requested the review of the Fine Art programmes, however, some of the information provided in the SER corresponds to the period prior to the breakdown of programmes in the Faculty³. Hence there is a level of ambition in this review process towards the implementation of any recommendations proposed by the Review Team through the ongoing restructuring of teaching programmes in the Faculty.

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

² SER p.3

³ SER p.3

The Faculty of Arts and Design structures its study programmes within a three-level higher education system within the field of Arts, in the two above mentioned programmes: Fine Arts and Design. The 4-year Bachelor's degree contains three pathways of studies: Design, Graphic Design, Photography and Time-Based Media. The 2-year Masters degrees include the following pathways: Design, Graphic Design, and Photography & Time-Based Media (the latter also offered in English) and a specialised Masters degree in Curatorial Studies⁴. The review was undertaken at all three cycles (BA, MA and PhD levels).

The review followed a three-stage process:

- The Faculty prepared the Self-Evaluation Report and supporting annexes, using the EQ-Arts SER template and based on EQ-Arts standards and guidelines for institutional review. This evaluation was also aligned to the Czech National Quality Standards for accreditation;
- An international Review Team associated with EQ-Arts studied the SER as well as the supporting documents provided by the Faculty and organised a site-visit and institutional review⁵, which took place between 21st and 23rd of October 2019. This visit enabled the Review Team to gain a better understanding of the work of the Faculty, within the University's and the national contexts and focused on the Institutional evaluation of the Fine Arts and Design programmes of studies.

During the Visit the Review Team had meetings with senior management (Governance, QA, Research & Enterprise, Support & Administration) to gain a greater understanding of the leadership, management and operational aspects of Faculty's quality culture. The Team also met with representatives of key stakeholders across the Faculty's academic provision (UG and PG students, teachers, researchers, alumni and employers as well as professional representatives).

As part of the activities carried out during the Visit, the Review Team was able to visit studios and workshops for all study programmes as well as exhibitions. This enabled the Review Team to gain a clear overview and understanding of the overall resources offered by the Faculty for the study programme, to enable them to confidently arrive at their assessment. The Review Team produced a comprehensive evaluative final report that follows and is structured in alignment to the EQ-Arts Standards.

- *Composition of the Review Team*

Dr Soledad Garcia Ferrari, Senior Lecturer in Architectural Design, Edinburgh College of Art, University of Edinburgh, s.garcia@ed.ac.uk

Professor Alistair Payne, Head of the School of Fine Art, Glasgow School of Art, A.Payne@gsa.ac.uk

Tamiko O'Brien, Principal, City & Guilds of London Art School: t.obrien@cityandguildsartschool.ac.uk

Dr Mike Fox, Senior Lecturer, Limerick School of Art and Design, Limerick City: Mike.Fox@lit.ie

⁴ SER p.7

⁵ See Annex 1 *Visit Schedule*

Johanna Kotlaris, visual and performance artist, BA Design Rietveld Academie Amsterdam, MA Fine Art Piet Zwart Institute Rotterdam, johanna.kotlaris@gmail.com

Schedule EQ-Arts Quality Assurance & Enhancement Review

Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem Faculty of Art and Design

Monday 21 October 2019

9h30 – 10h15 RT meet the Head of the Institution

- doc. Mgr. A. Pavel Mrkus – Dean of Faculty

10h30 – 11h30 RT meet the Head(s) of the Programme(s) to be reviewed

- doc. Mgr. A. Daniel Hanzlík – Guarantee of Bachelor Study Programme Visual Art
- doc. Mgr. Michaela Thelenová – Guarantee of Master Study Programme Fine Arts
- doc. Mgr. Zdena Kolečková, Ph.D. – Guarantee of Master Study Programme Visual Art (in English Language)
- prof. Michal Koleček, Ph.D. – Guarantee of PhD Study Programme Visual Communication and Master Study Programme Visual Art (specialization Curatorial Study)

11h45-12h15 RT meet BA students from the programme(s) to be reviewed

- Alexandra Naušová (DM, 4.)
- Simona Patelisová (DM, 3.)
- Kateřina Nováčková (FO, 4.)
- Lucie Nožková (AARF, 4.)
- Dominik Kobeda (IM, 3.)
- Vojtěch Grott (TMB, 2.)

13h30 – 14h30 RT meet MA students from the programme(s) to be reviewed

- BcA. Karim Tarakji (TMB, 1.)
- BcA. Filip Švácha (AARF, 1.)
- Bc. Dany Josué Vigil Avilés (PH, 2.)
- Bc. Diana Kněžínková, Bc. Kristýna Hájková, Bc. Alžběta Horáčková (KS, 2.)
- BcA. Robin Seidl (PE, 1.)
- BcA. Krištof Vitner (IM, 1.)
- Bc. Václav Dvořák (FO, 2.)

14h45 – 15h45 RT meet teachers from the programme(s) to be reviewed

- MgA. Jiří Dvořák (AARF, assistant of studio)
- Lukáš Jasanský (FO, head of studio) and Silvie Milková (FO, assistant of studio)
- doc. Mgr. Zdena Kolečková, Ph.D. (PH, head of studio)
- doc. Jiří Kovanda (PE, head of studio)
- doc. Mgr. A. Pavel Kopřiva, Ph.D. (IM)
- MgA. Radek Jandera, Ph.D. (DM, assistant of studio)

- doc. Mgr. A. Daniel Hanzlík and doc. Mgr. A. Pavel Mrkus (TMB, heads of studio)
- prof. Michal Koleček, Ph.D. (KDTU, academic, head of studio of Curatorial Study)
- Mgr. Lenka Sýkorová, Ph.D. (KDTU, academic / teacher of theory)

16h00 – 17h00 RT meet alumni of the programme(s) to be reviewed

- Martin Krupa (DM)
- Jiří Dvořák (AARF)
- Alexandra Chytra (PH)
- Markéta Souhradová (PE)
- Iva Polanecká (TMB)
- Petr Hanžl (TMB)
- Jáchym Myslivec (FO)
- Lucie Kabrlová (KS)
- Michaela Spružinová (KS)
- Miroslav Hašek (DM + PhD)
- Jan Krtička (PhD)
- Silvie Milková (PhD)

Tuesday 22 October 2019

09h30 – 10h30 RT meet programme(s) research staff & students

- Yuk Bun Wan (PhD student)
- Zdeněk Svejkský (PhD student)
- Marija Mandić (PhD student)
- Ivana Zochová (PhD student)
- Pavel Matoušek (PhD student)
- Barbora Müllerová/Zavadilová (PhD student)
- MgA. Adéla Machová, Ph.D. (KDTU, academic / teacher of art theory)
- Mgr. Anna Vartecká, Ph.D. (KDTU, academic / teacher of art theory)
- doc. Mgr. Kateřina Dytrtová, Ph.D. (KDTU, academic / teacher of theory)

10h45 – 11h45 RT meet programme(s) technical and support staff

- MgA. Martina Lišková, Mgr. Eva Mráziková, Ph.D. – PR office of faculty
- Mgr. Miroslav Matoušek – financial management of faculty
- Veronika Sládková and Mgr. Monika Matoušková – Study Department
- Markéta Vlčková – Erasmus office
- Klára Mrkusová – edition of faculty
- MgA. Adéla Machová, Ph.D. – project management office
- MgA. Pavel Matoušek, Ph.D., MgA. Jiří Bartoš – workshops
- MgA. Lada Semecká and MgA. Jan Verner – Studio of Spatial Work

12h00 – 13h00 RT meet representatives of the professions and employers

- Eva Mráziková (Director of Emil Filla Gallery), employer of students
- Tomáš Petermann – Public Hall Hraničář, employer of students
- Katherine Kastner (Owner of Huntkasner Gallery in Prague), employer of students
- Tereza Nováková (Gallery of Pardubice and Symposium Loblhög & Artgrund, free-lance curator)
- Ludvík Hlaváček (Director of Center and Foundation of Contemporary Art in Prague)
- František Pecháček – artist
- Petr Pufler – artist
- Gabriela Procházka (Lunchmeat Festival organiser in Prague) – artist
- Tomáš Herzog – artist
- Tomáš Lumpe – artist
- Lucie Kabrlová (Gallery of Modern Art in Roudnice nad Labem, curator and PR)

14h00 – 15h00 RT meet institute Quality Assurance staff

- doc. Mgr. Michaela Thelenová (Vice-Dean for Study)
- doc. Mgr. Zdena Kolečková, Ph.D. (Vice-Dean for Creative Work)
- doc. Mgr. A. Pavel Mrkus (Dean of Faculty)

15h15 – 16h15 RT meet Institute Senior Management Group (Senate or equivalent)

- Senate of FAD – doc. PhDr. Tomáš Pavlíček, Ph.D. (academic) and BcA. Karim Tarakji (member/student)
- Main collegium board (Dean and Vice-Deans) – doc. Mgr. A. Pavel Mrkus, PhDr. Jaroslav Polanecký, PhD., MgA. Marcel Mochal, doc. Mgr. Michaela Thelenová, doc. Mgr. Zdena Kolečková, Ph.D.

16h30 – 18h00 RT visit programme(s') studios/workshops

Wednesday 23 October 2019

09h00 – 09h15 RT meet liaison person

13h00 – 13h30 Oral feedback to the Head of Institution and colleagues

- Dean – doc. Mgr. A. Pavel Mrkus
- Vice-Deans – doc. Mgr. Michaela Thelenová, doc. Mgr. Zdena Kolečková, Ph.D., PhDr. Jaroslav Polanecký, PhD., MgA. Marcel Mochal

Shortcuts:

DM – Studio of Digital Media

IM – Studio of Interactive Media

TBM – Studio of Time-Based Media

PE – Studio of Performance

PH – Studio of Photography (teach in English language)

AARF – Studio of Applied and Advertising Photography

FO – Studio of Photography

KS – Studio of Curatorial Study

KDTU – Department of Theory and History of Art

The Review Team would like to express its gratitude to the Faculty's Dean, his colleagues and very loyal and supportive team of staff and students for their professionalism in providing the framework for this review. The visit and meetings were carried out within a positive and constructive attitude of all parties, which contributed the success of this enhancement process. We would also thank Adéla Machova for the excellent organisation of the site-visits and for supporting the Review Team.

1. Programme's goals and context

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

The primary mission of the Faculty (as described in the 'Constitution of Faculty of Art and Design') is to: "provide higher education in Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctoral programmes of studies, and to develop free artistic, scientific, research and other creative activities in the field of visual arts"⁶

Furthermore, the Faculty outlined its broader mission, aims and vision through three related, yet specific, agendas: *Education, Research* and *Social Responsibility*. This vision lends a strong perspective to the future ambitions of the Faculty, outlining its core values and setting a strong benchmark from which to move forward. This vision interrelates the student and staff body and aligns the internal ambitions of the Faculty with the wider local and international contexts⁷, (presented in Meetings 1 & 2⁸). The primary objectives of the Faculty revolve around five areas, Educational Activity, Creative Activity, Internationalisation, Social Role and Development Activities⁹.

Education: the Faculty outlined the importance of the educational, learning and teaching priorities within the Strategic Plan¹⁰ (discussed in Meeting 1¹¹), in the development of the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, and doctoral studies. The primary focus of this is to develop and train artists and designers for a future within the creative arts with advanced knowledge of their personal artistic and curatorial or theoretical-research activities.

Research: the research profile of staff is fundamental to the Faculty and the organisation of the educational aspects of the mission and future vision. Supported by internal grants and publishing opportunities, staff are actively encouraged to be practicing artists in their field of expertise at a national and international level.

Social Responsibility: social responsibility is one of the core tenets of the Faculty's institutional mission, in a local, national and international sense. Locally the Faculty focuses upon enhancing and supporting the local community through creative means, seeking broader societal impact.

The Faculty's mission objectives (as outlined in the Strategic Plan¹², the SER¹³ and Meeting 1¹⁴), align to the creative agenda and propose an educational environment that supports learning within the arts and through academic research. The Faculty also undertakes external promotion of these activities as methods for enhancing (and accelerating), the artistic and cultural environment of the city, in which international perspectives can be brought into the local community¹⁵.

⁶ Annex 2 *Constitution of the Faculty of Art and Design*, p.1 Article 3

⁷ SER p.4 and 7

⁸ Meeting 1 with Head of Institution and Meeting 2 with Heads of Department

⁹ SER p.8

¹⁰ Annex 3 *Strategic Plan FAD 2016-2020*

¹¹ Meeting 1 with Head of Institution

¹² Annex 3 *Strategic Plan FAD 2016-2020*

¹³ SER p. 7

¹⁴ Meeting 1 with Head of Institution

¹⁵ SER p. 9

A core development within the Faculty is the recent set up of the House of Art, which will function as the connecting point between the mission drivers: education, research and social responsibility¹⁶. This enables students to present work to a public audience, the dissemination of academic research as well as promotes social and cultural engagement.

The uniqueness of the Faculty stems from its beginnings in 1992, with an immersion in photography and photographic processes¹⁷. Since then, the Faculty actively engaged with developments around new-media, advanced digital imaging and beyond, whilst at the same time ensuring to retain the core principles of artistic education in relation to sculpture, printmaking and painting, as described in the section above within the three fields of study¹⁸. It was outlined during the review that this constructs the Faculty's unique and distinctive educational context, differentiating it from other art-based institutions in the Czech Republic¹⁹ (also presented in Meetings 1 & 2²⁰).

The undergraduate Fine Art programme is structured in order to facilitate and prepare artists for work in the following spheres: design, photography, graphic design, and applied art, and for studies in the Master's study programme²¹. Alongside this, there is a branch of study titled; Photography and Time-Based Media. There are two postgraduate programmes Master in Fine Art (one in Czech language and the other in English language – with a branch of study titled; Photography and Time-Based Media) and a branch of study titled; Curatorship Studies²². The BA and MA programmes are complemented by a full doctoral programme of study (3 years). There are three fields of study within the BA and MA programmes, *studio* – which is taught differently dependent upon the Head of Studio and required practical skills – for example; drawing, painting and modelling, as well as theory (specifically in the context of Fine Art)²³. There is a split between theory and studio on the BA programme, which equates to one third theory and two thirds studio, whilst at the MA stage it is an equitable division of 50:50. Studio teaching is vertically structured with BA and MA students sharing the same studio²⁴.

The alignment of the programmes and the educational aspects of student delivery tie into the ambitions of the Faculty²⁵. However, the Review Team noted that a stronger focus on strategic development across the three areas; Education, Research and Social Responsibility would help in assuring that the mission of the Faculty is strengthened and articulated.

The Review Team identified that a stronger alignment between the above core areas could be developed strategically within the mission and future vision of the Faculty and in particular within the development and ongoing curriculum review of the Fine Arts programmes. In light of the strength of the ambitions around social engagement, the Review Team suggests that by strategically interconnecting education and research in alignment with social responsibility and embedding this within the Faculty's

¹⁶ Meeting 1 with Head of Institution

¹⁷ SER p. 5

¹⁸ SER p. 6

¹⁹ SER p. 4, 7 and 8

²⁰ Meeting 1 with Head of Institution and Meeting 2 with Heads of Department

²¹ SER p.7-8

²² SER p.8

²³ Meeting 2 with Heads of Programme

²⁴ Meeting 5 with Teachers from the Programme

²⁵ SER p.4, 7-8, Meeting 1 Head of Institution and Meeting 2 Heads of Programme

mission, will bring real benefit. These benefits will be evidenced through an enhanced student and staff experience and will contribute to strengthen the position the Faculty, locally, nationally and internationally. The strategies developed within the three core areas of education, research and social responsibility, should indicate a five-to-ten-year plan and inform and establish the framework of the Faculty's mission statement for the Fine Arts programmes. This should include enhancing and developing frameworks within the educational structures for BA and MA study, whilst developing a clear strategy for research.

The assurance of quality of provision and the enhancement of the student experience really need to be central drivers behind the development of the strategies aligned to the Faculty's mission. This needs to include approaches of internal quality enhancements, programme and course specifications, improved educational frameworks (ILO's and assessment criteria, as well as assessment procedures). As identified during the review, in FAD, the Programme Guarantor is in charge of writing a programme report (containing statistical data, capturing student information and feedback, graduate employability, creative activities by staff and students and a SWOT analysis). This report is produced every five years²⁶. Quality Management is overseen by core staff including the Dean of Faculty, Vice-Dean for Study and the Vice-Dean for Creative Work²⁷. Accreditation is achieved through the following process and committee structure: Deans College followed by the Artistic Board and then finally the Senate²⁸.

The admissions process was outlined to be complex due to the location and proximity of art schools in the capital, Prague, and the historical and social context of the local environment²⁹. It was outlined that this creates added pressure for the Faculty in terms of student numbers and, at times, it challenges retention of students through their study. One example of this was provided in relation to the MA Curatorial Practice programme, which is the first of its kind in the Czech Republic, and therefore should be a strength in relation to admissions requests. However, recruitment had not been achieved as planned in the last cycle³⁰.

In relation to student retention, it would be useful to consider the recommendations outlined by the Review Team throughout this report, as a method for defining and assuring quality of provision, whilst enhancing study opportunities for students where possible.

The accreditation of the courses and programme was outlined through the SER³¹, including the following processes:

- *National Accreditation Bureau for Higher Education, which is governed by Act No. 111/1998 on Higher Education Institutions and on Amendments and Supplements to some other Acts (the Higher Education Act), the Amendment to the Higher Education Act and also Government Decree No. 274/2016 Coll., of 24 August 2016 on Standards for Accreditation in Higher Education. In addition, the Faculty follows the University document Rules of Creation, Approval, and Modification of Programmes of Study of the JEPU.*

²⁶ Meeting 10 with Quality Assurance Staff

²⁷ Annex 4 *Decision-Making Process*

²⁸ Meeting 1 with Head of Institution

²⁹ Meeting 1 with Head of Institution and Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes

³⁰ Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes

³¹ SER p.11

- *Here is a brief description of the process leading to accreditation. The proposal to submit an application for accreditation is first discussed by the Faculty Arts Council and then approved by the Academic Senate of the Faculty. Then the proposal is submitted to the JEPU Rector and approved by the JEPU Internal Assessment Council. After this approval, the accreditation material is sent to the National Accreditation Bureau for Higher Education for review. If the accreditation material is approved, the University / Faculty receives an official decision on obtaining the accreditation, stating how long period the accreditation is obtained for. After this period, the Faculty must go through the whole process again.*

It was evident through the meetings that these processes have been followed, including discussions with the Head of the institution and the Heads of Department³². It was also evident that the programme guarantor has a key role in the development of the structure and content of the programme of study.³³

The institution uses a system called STAG to collect data on programmes.³⁴ The STAG system collates the following information³⁵:

- *The number of applicants*
- *The number of admitted students*
- *The number of enrolled students*
- *The number of graduates*
- *The number of foreign students and graduates*
- *The number of successful and unsuccessful studies*
- *Information on international mobility*
- *The number of bachelor's, diploma and dissertation theses being defended*
- *The number of the theses passed*

As described above, the development of the programme is focused through the Programme Guarantor, Heads of Department and Heads of Studio (with particular reference to the content of delivery). The model of curriculum development is primarily focused through the research excellence of the teaching staff, where this could be supported by a more inclusive approach taken into consideration students and stakeholders' opinions.³⁶

The Faculty uses the institutional approach to the assurance of equal opportunities, although does have a highly commended student support team.³⁷ As stated in the SER, *"The Faculty does not explicitly deal with the issue of equal opportunities in its official documents. At the University level, there is the "Rector's Directive No. 1/2015 Methodology for Supporting and Equalizing the Conditions of Applicants*

³² Meeting 1 with Head of Institution and Meeting 2 with Heads of Programme

³³ SER p.12

³⁴ SER p.11 and Meeting 5 with Teachers of the Programme

³⁵ During the visit access to STAG was granted to the Review Team

³⁶ Meetings 2 with Heads of Programmes, Meeting 3 with BA Students, Meeting 4 with MA Students, Meeting 5 with Teachers and Meeting 9 with representatives of the Professions and Employers.

³⁷ SER p.12-13

and Students with Special Needs at JEPU". The University also has a University Support Centre for students with special needs."³⁸

A core focus within the Faculty should be placed to ensure equal opportunities across the programmes of study for all students, as well as across the teaching staff team. This would be in relation to admissions, disability (access, etc.) as well as approaches to teaching within the courses and ensuring parity of experience through an enhancement-led approach.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 1

Commendation:

- The Review Team commends the ambition of the Faculty's mission, particularly in relation to social engagement and internationalisation and the energy with which the Faculty works within the city and the region to promote and develop the artistic community at local and regional levels. (1)

Recommendations:

- The educational purpose of the Faculty's mission should be strengthened, and a stronger alignment should be achieved with strategic planning across research, learning and teaching, public engagement and the development of a quality and assurance culture, broadly at the Faculty and within the Fine Arts programmes. (1)
- The degree programmes need to clearly define their specific aims in relation to the Faculty's mission and more qualitative data should be collected and used in this process. (2)
- The employment of a constructively aligned learning outcome and assessment strategy, with considered benchmarks for each level of the programmes, BA, MA and PhD, will benefit the student experience and provide assurance of the quality of assessment. Evaluating the learner journey from application to graduation will be important in this context. This could be achieved through the development of a *learning and teaching working group*, with the key task of aligning the benchmark statements around Intended Learning Outcomes and Assessment Criteria of the Fine Arts programmes. (3)
- Employing annual reporting as a way of evaluating and monitoring activities, the Faculty's alignment with its mission and the quality of the student experience. This may include proactively taking ownership of the University's processes to create a useful and constructive tool for self-evaluation that helps identify strengths, weaknesses and opportunities to enhance the Faculty mission across the three core areas. (4)
- The Faculty should develop a recruitment strategy that looks across all Fine Art programmes in order to encapsulate strengths, whilst enabling clear recording of student numbers, student offer targets against actual targets, whilst constructing an approach to marketing the programmes that is embedded within the context of the overall mission. (5)

- A more contextualised overview of student retention (and also of the quality of the student experience), through the organisation of feedback fora, questionnaires and methods for students to raise any issues within the Faculty and provide suggestions that may lead to strategic development. (6)

The Review Team find that FAD, Purkyne University is overall **substantially compliant** in Standard 1 for the study programme *Fine Arts*.

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 Review Team spent time discussing and reviewing different curricular structures, including Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO), Assessment Criteria (effectively evidence of constructive alignment), skill acquisition, level-learning and progression (forms of differentiation between levels and awards), the student journey (what does it look like) and importantly, the student experience.³⁹ The Review Team also spent time learning more about the studio structures, including the Head of Studio role and the structures that compose the study path.⁴⁰

There are elements of significant consideration being given to, and applied in, the studio structures, such as 'vertical' learning, where students from different years (and programme levels) share the studio environment.⁴¹

The Guarantor of the programme is the key person responsible for the development of the structure and content of the programme, as well as the preparation of material for accreditation for the National Accreditation Bureau for Higher Education and report writing for the JEPU Internal Assessment Council.⁴² During the current preparation of the bachelor's degree accreditation, a broad discursive and inclusive (across staff) discussion took place in which input was provided to the update of study subjects in light of current requirements of practice.⁴³ Full accreditation information is outlined in section 1 above.

³⁹ SER p.11, 14, 15

⁴⁰ Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes and Meeting 5 with Teachers

⁴¹ Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes, Meeting 3 with BA Students, Meeting 4 with MA Students, Meeting 5 with Teachers and Meeting 12 Visit to Studios and Workshops

⁴² SER p.12

⁴³ SER p.12

The curriculum reflects the Faculty's mission through two primary objectives; Educational Activity and Creative Activity.⁴⁴ In effect this focuses upon the training and development of professional artists, curators or theorists, essentially under the mission of Education, with both of these objectives fostering the development of the curriculum. Therefore, the aims of the programmes are tied into the mission overall, and this is reflected in the structure of the curriculum in order to produce advanced, knowledgeable practitioners with a wealth of knowledge and understanding of their chosen field and experience through testing this work to a public audience.

It is important to reflect on the quality assurance processes throughout all of the mechanisms and structures of the student learner journey, and the Faculty have begun to put these quality mechanisms in place, with the allocation of staff (high-level) whose role is partially to focus upon quality assurance.⁴⁵ However, there is still some distance to travel. It is important that the Faculty reflects over quality assurance through an enhancement-led approach. Within this approach it will be imperative to embed clear learning outcomes for students in order that they are completely aware of the expectations of the course of study, whilst also giving clarity around expectations for, and of, assessment.

In addition, it has been stated by the Faculty that students are not directly included in programme design or enhancement, however they have the opportunity to provide their opinions on study plans and subjects through a questionnaire on STAG.⁴⁶

The Learning Outcomes for the courses do not seem clearly articulated and therefore the assessment criteria against these was not evident across the information reviewed. This is problematic when considering the modes of studio-based assessment within the Fine Arts programmes and when seeking understanding of what a student can expect to be assessed against in the studio defence, as this is the primary assessment mode (see section 2.3). In addition it was indicated that it is problematic for students to develop their own individual study profiles.⁴⁷ This is partially due to the complex arrangement of electives and core elements of study as outlined in the SER, review of this alongside the development of a student-centred focus would greatly benefit the learner journey and the student learning experience.

Ensuring that learning outcomes are strongly aligned into the assessment criteria would be extremely beneficial for the students in understanding the objective of the courses and requirements made upon their learning. This will also provide a framework to ensure the quality of provision that has real clarity (for staff and students) in the progression through the learner journey. In creating and embedding these processes, changes will need to be made in relation to the operational aspects of the course structures, including documentation made available and modes of teaching as well as assessment. This will also assist in developing curricular changes within courses, lend clarity to the levels of study and also assist in real definitions between BA (years), MA and PhD.

It is stated in the SER that the learning outcomes are defined in the curriculum description, whilst it also states that the learning outcomes are more preparational for advanced practice on completion of the

⁴⁴ SER p.8

⁴⁵ Meeting 2 with Heads of Programme

⁴⁶ SER p.14

⁴⁷ SER p.15

programme rather than learning outcomes modelled to courses.⁴⁸ The skills acquired by students ‘generally correspond’ to the Dublin Descriptors.⁴⁹

At the moment research fits into the curriculum through the individual expertise of the associated Professor or Head of Studio and the review team identified in the current structure of the studio this could be seen as a positive enabler for innovative working practices. However, there should be a broader and more expansive embedding of research within modes of study and these should be evidencable as learning outcomes and appropriately assessed at the end of the course/year.⁵⁰ The strength of staff research and its visibility should support curriculum development and enhancement.

As outlined in the SER⁵¹ (and described more fully in Meeting 1⁵²), study profiles can only be developed “partially and to a relatively low level”, this is due in many ways to the defined courses, elective courses and optional courses. It would be beneficial to enhance the opportunity for students to be able to develop their own study profiles more independently and with a greater degree of flexibility. This could be achieved through a reflective analysis and enhancement of the structural framework within the teaching approaches and identified core alongside optional/elective choices.

The Faculty should positively address the notion of the student activity (and motivation), which was outlined as the “student responsibility”⁵³, where the curricular construction, or framework for engaging students could be considered as a method for enabling student-led enhancements, whilst undertaking their study. An aspect of Fine Art learning is a form of independent study and the growth of independence through study levels, whilst this is fundamental for the generation of a student’s understanding of their practice, it is also important that other modes of learning are intricately embedded and interwoven through their learning journey. In order for this to become productive, supporting staff development around teaching and learning would be most productive for the Faculty. This indicates that the Faculty could develop a method for supporting new models of teaching that inform different ways of thinking and learning within the curriculum.

It was apparent that there is an evidencable progression between undergraduate and postgraduate study, with a number of students progressing through the Faculty within their studio environment, which is very positive. Connectivity between studios was discussed in the meetings,⁵⁴ and the review team understood that this could be enhanced to encourage greater levels of cross-disciplinary work and also a greater sense of the broader academic community. It is also stated in the SER⁵⁵ that one of the aims of the programme structure (the undergraduate award) “prepares the student for the Master’s programme”. It is also important to note that the verticality of the studio-based structure with BA and MA students sharing studio space and the PhD students actively involved in teaching, enables an interconnected studio within which students are exposed to different learning and teaching levels and approaches.

⁴⁸ SER p.14

⁴⁹ SER p.15

⁵⁰ SER p.16 and Meeting 1 with Head of Institution, Meeting 2 with Heads of Programme and Meeting 7 with Research Staff

⁵¹ SER p.15

⁵² Meeting 1 with Head of Institution

⁵³ Meeting 2 with Head of Programmes and Meeting 5 with Teachers

⁵⁴ Meeting 2 with Head of Programme and Meeting 5 with Teachers

⁵⁵ SER p.16

The strategies involved in learning and teaching within the FAD Fine Arts curriculum, include lectures and seminars for theoretical subjects, and personal tutoring, lectures and 'practicals' in the studio. There are also weekly studio review meetings, which the students found to be very important in terms of sharing working practices and receiving advice on their own practical work.⁵⁶ Doctorate (PhD) students also organise colloquiums, lectures and workshops for junior students in their studios, in order to transfer research knowledge widely⁵⁷. PhD students are also encouraged to teach into the BA and MA programmes.⁵⁸

The Faculty offers opportunities for students to present their practice internally and externally,⁵⁹ one of the core drivers educationally is for students to test their artistic practice in professional environments, which is highly commendable. This presents students with an opportunity to enhance their understanding of their professional requirements as an artist in their chosen field.

Critical reflection and also self-reflection are important facets of the Fine Arts programmes, whether through the critical studies aspects of the student's learning, which supports the studio courses, or through considerations of the submission of work for the studio viva examinations at the end of year. Students outlined that critical reflection was actively encouraged through the weekly consultation, in which staff and students from the studio come together to critique the work⁶⁰ and students commented positively on the support gained from the consultation process.

Research within the Faculty is divided into two areas, firstly classical theoretical research and secondly artistic research. Research within these models differs but is wedded into the students learning and evident through the research knowledge and expertise of the staff team. Research knowledge enhancement is also evident through the work of PhD students⁶¹ and their interaction with the student community within the Faculty (as well as teaching in the studio). It was also outlined to the review team that research is mainly practical: mediation and creation.⁶² As teaching is primarily delivered by academic staff within each studio, often the research components are directly linked either to the academic staff personal research and/or their knowledge within the field of study.

This relates with the response outlined above in section (j). The curriculum is maintained by the academic staff, projects and work facilitated by them and therefore academic research directly informs the direction of travel in relation to student learning development. Research gained or undertaken through international exchange and experience (exhibitions/conferences) also supports the teaching within studio. In the document titled 'Directions of Creative, Artistic and Scientific Activities' the role of research within the curriculum is defined, for example under the following agendas:⁶³

⁵⁶ Meeting 3 with BA Students

⁵⁷ Meeting 5 with Teachers

⁵⁸ SER p.16

⁵⁹ SER p.15-16

⁶⁰ Meeting 7 with Research Staff and Students

⁶¹ SER p.16

⁶² Meeting 7 with Research Staff and Students

⁶³ Annex 5 *Directions of Creative, Artistic and Scientific Activities* p.3

- Studying the issues of seeing and evaluating images, imaging and visual representation;
- Approaches to visualisation and reconstruction of the world;
- Data visualisation;
- Visualisation of social differences and turn to the image in social sciences;
- Language and iconology of the text

Research is evidently very important to the Faculty and the modes of teaching are addressed through the expertise of staff and their field of research.⁶⁴ In effect, staff research becomes the central curricula focus through the Head of Studio and the vertical structure of the studio areas. This means that research feeds directly into the student's assignments, activities and tasks. However, it will be important for the Faculty to review and develop the individual research patterns of the students. In essence, this could see a greater alignment or connectivity between the critical studies elements (art theory) of the programme and the studio courses. Although research is obviously a core factor institutionally, it is difficult to perceive how this is embedded within the student's artistic practice. Understanding how research is considered through assessment would be beneficial for students, in particular with reference to clarifying the assessment criteria and also potentially embedding this into learning outcomes. This will help to ensure that research and its importance academically is made transparent to all students.

The Faculty should look to support academic (teaching) staff in developing their expertise in relation to learning and teaching. Where research is very important institutionally, the support for teaching is equally important in terms of enhancing the student's experience and developing new methods of teaching practice. In essence this should be equitably split, with learning and teaching commanding and equal standing as research, both in relation to output, but also the development of new knowledge.

Students can gain guidance in relation to their academic study and career opportunities (academic, studio teaching staff) and also personal guidance through the students support team who are available to give academic and personal guidance to current students as well as applicants to the programmes.⁶⁵ Alongside the opportunities for students to exhibit beyond the Faculty, it would be of real benefit to consider how professional practice, in relation to the development of key life skills, could be integrated into the students learning at all levels of study.

Comments, commendations, and recommendations for improvement for Standard 2.1

Commendation:

- The Review Team acknowledges and commends the work carried out in the development of the new benchmark statements for programmes (BA and MA levels). (2)

Recommendations:

- To review, re-think and clearly define 'student-centred learning', which should relate not only to student's opportunities for independent development, but also consider their involvement in defining learning outcomes, assessment structures, study pathways, etc. (7)

⁶⁴ SER p.16 and Meeting 7 with Research Staff and Students

⁶⁵ Meeting 4 with MA Students

- Participation form stakeholders should be more clearly embedded in the development of the curriculum for the programmes of studies – the ‘*Programme/Degree Review Board*’ that has recently been set up is a good step towards this. Clear guidelines, including quality indicators that the institution requires, should be given to programme leaders (Guarantors) and stakeholders to understand the purpose of this feedback exercise. (8)
- Student’s expected achievements at each level and the links between levels in study programmes should be clearly set up and presented in detail as well as communicated through programme specification documents. The development of critical reflection and its alignment to the studio will enable students to understand in greater depth their progression and learning through their levels of study. (9)
- A staff development policy around ‘teaching as a practice’ should be put in place. This should influence teaching methods and help to develop the academic/educational framework around constructive alignment and quality assurance of processes within the BA and MA curricula. (10)
- More flexible study pathways consistent across all programmes of studies should be developed, which the new building and carefully considered programme review structures should contribute to. (11)
- Greater levels of research and critical reflection with the incorporation of more evident alignments between research and practice within studio courses ILO’s and therefore with assessment at the end of the studio courses. (12)
- Enhancing the clarity of the role of research within the educational strategy and its importance in relation to curriculum development, as well as the interrelationship between learning, teaching and research within the studio. (13)

The Review Team find that FAD, Purkyne University is overall **partially compliant** in Standard 2.1 for the study programme *Fine Arts*. (see Section 9 for compliance of 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3)

2.2 International perspectives

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

The institution and therefore Faculty are defining their approaches to internationalisation within their mission.⁶⁶ There are fundamentally three linked routes to internationalisation as outlined during the site-visit and documentation. These are: staff research and its international scope, Erasmus and student movement and engagement; and from the perspective of social-responsibility, which as a primary facet

⁶⁶ SER p.17-19

of the Faculty mission, the local and broader national contexts within which the Faculty primarily engages, although with ambition to have broader and a more internationalised focus.

The Faculty is very engaged with Erasmus exchange with numerous partners and staff employed to oversee the development of Erasmus international study opportunities.⁶⁷ From a student perspective this is very promising and with exchange the transition of students into and out of the Faculty does lend to international experience, either brought in or whilst studying abroad. However, the review team suggests that the relationship between Erasmus partners and other international partners could be better aligned with the curriculum, through exploring links with staff research. Understanding external institutions and exploring strategic alignment of the Erasmus partners with the mission of the Faculty in relation to education, would be beneficial.

The international dimension is integrated into the curriculum in different ways, including external exhibitions, which the students can participate in, Erasmus exchange opportunities, lecture series in English,⁶⁸ foreign language literature (library support) and foreign visiting artists (once a semester). The Faculty also organises international excursions for staff and students, for example, to the Venice Biennale, Milano Mobile or Ars Electronica.⁶⁹

Whereas there are no identifiable learning outcomes that directly relate to internationalisation, the SER does state that a focus of internationally oriented activities can be identified in the emphasis on high quality visiting staff, and in the general awareness offered to staff and students in relation to events in the field in the international context. How this is assessed was not clear in the paperwork or through the meetings during the review, other than a broader assessment framework of research applied to theoretical submissions and understanding of wider contexts of practice within studio⁷⁰.

If we see internationalisation having a two-part effect, where student mobilisation and international opportunities aligned to this are seen as one, curricular opportunities and the expansion of international understanding of the subject area, is another one. The latter should be embedded into the structural frameworks of courses and programme specifications, essentially aligned to learning outcomes. This would allow students to understand how their learning has enveloped an international dimension and therefore the impacts of this approach to learning on their study, experience and development. As there are currently not clearly identifiable learning outcomes for the students, it is very difficult to understand how a student might engage with internationalised approaches, and essentially how they might see the benefits of international experiences within their own learning.

The programme is connected to different international partnerships, either through Erasmus, or Horizon 2020 and EU Culture programmes.⁷¹ There are also research collaborations as outlined by the research staff and research is disseminated internationally through conferences and exhibitions from both staff and students⁷². Grant activities are also in place supported by the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic that supports staff participation in exhibitions, conferences and competitions abroad.

⁶⁷ SER p.18-19 and Meeting 8 with Technical and Support Staff

⁶⁸ SER p.17

⁶⁹ SER p.18

⁷⁰ SER p.19

⁷¹ SER p.18

⁷² Meeting 7 with Research Staff and Students

As was outlined by the Heads of Department, there is not a large number of international direct applicants to programmes, although the review team met one international student.⁷³ However, through the Erasmus exchange programme, international students spend a semester in the Faculty. These students are supported by the Erasmus office and also the student support office. Overall the Faculty has highest ratio of Erasmus students incoming and outgoing within the university, which has been constant over several years.

The Faculty has international staff teaching into the programme⁷⁴, and this is achieved either through research reciprocation with partners or through Erasmus staff exchange. It is also stated that international teachers are invited as visitors into the studios at least once a semester.⁷⁵

The Faculty explained some issues in relation to international student recruitment, (which also apply to Czech applicants), included the establishment of the Private Artistic Schools (in the Czech Republic) and also the demographic nature of the environs (number of young people)⁷⁶, although there are mechanisms to support international student application from application to conversion. In many ways this revolved around the enticement of students applying to the Faculty when the capital city is geographically very close. However, the clearly unique approach to learning within a Fine Art context – in relation to the focus upon new digital technologies, new media as well as VR – offers a ‘Unique Selling Point’ (USP) that is essentially different.⁷⁷ This ambition could support greater levels of international student application.

In many ways the development of international experience for academic staff comes through their own personal research practices, often through international exhibitions or conferences, and this is important in the context of the Faculty, with staff visiting other institutions through Erasmus exchange and international academic staff visiting the Faculty from abroad.

The Faculty explained their organisation under the umbrella “internationalisation@home”, in the SER: *“Although the Faculty does not formally follow the positions and strategies of the “Internationalization @ home” community, it can be said that most of their key topics are relevant to it. However, it develops and applies them rather based on the need for natural democratic and creative cognition, the need to build and develop a creative space as open and permeable to all diverse cultural influences as possible”*⁷⁸.

In relation to internationalisation, the Fine Arts programme is supported by Faculty staff whose primary focus is on either Quality Assurance (Vice Deans) or Erasmus exchange (specific Erasmus staff member appointed to oversee exchange). This does not represent directly an approach to QA on internationalisation, but there is a method by which this can take place. The Review Team suggests that enhancing the approach to QA in relation to internationalisation would be of benefit and would support the development of a strategic approach to the Faculty’s mission directives. Essentially this means

⁷³ Meeting 3 with BA Students and Meeting 4 with MA Students

⁷⁴ Meeting with Heads of Programmes

⁷⁵ SER p,18-19

⁷⁶ Meeting 2 with Heads of Department, Meeting 5 with Teachers, Meeting 8 with Technical and Support Staff (Erasmus) and also Meeting 11 with Management Team

⁷⁷ Meeting 12 Visit to Studios and Workshops, Meeting 1 with Head of Institution and Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes

⁷⁸ SER p.19

reviewing international partners to ensure compatibility for different reasons or purposes, either student exchange, strategic approaches to staff exchange, as well as the support of research and collaborative opportunities.

Comments, commendations, and recommendations for improvement for Standard 2.2

Commendation:

- The Review Team commends the institution on how the students are given opportunities to present their work at national and international events, as well as to include their work in current Faculty's publications. (3)

Recommendations:

- A clear international strategy should be interwoven through the three-part mission of the Faculty: Education, Research and Social Responsibility. The development of this should construct the embedded nature of internationalisation within the curriculum and therefore be visible from a student perspective within the Fine Arts programmes. (14)
- Staff development should also be linked with the Faculty's internationalisation strategy, as staff could benefit from more international experiences. In this context, recruitment of international staff would enrich teaching and research approaches across the Faculty. Defining how the Faculty's international strategy could support staff development around pedagogic practices and the impacts in/on the curriculum. (15)
- Quality assurance mechanisms in relation to internationalisation should be set up and this should be at the heart of any future developments in the Faculty, defining a strategic approach to internationalisation across its educational and research strands. (16)

The Review Team find that FAD, Purkyne University is overall **substantially compliant** in Standard 2.2 for the study programme *Fine Arts*. (see Section 9 for compliance of 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3)

2.3 Assessment

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

The Faculty currently operates through two different assessment processes (for BA and MA level study). From a studio-based perspective this is focused upon an end of semester viva-voce defence of their studio-based work, whilst the theoretical mode of study is assessed through the submission of written work.⁷⁹ The Review Team found it difficult to assess whether the methods for assessment represent achievement of learning outcomes as the learning outcomes (as a successful artist for example) are

⁷⁹ SER, p. 20-21, Meeting 1 with Head of Institution, Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes and Meeting 5 with Teachers

rather generic, please refer to the recommendations below. Whilst an external is chosen to sit on the viva process, it is clear that this external is not there to observe the assessment process itself as a method for benchmarking awards, and also assuring the quality of the assessment approach, but rather as an active assessor of the student's work in their own right.

The SER states that "The Faculty follows the JEPU Study and examination code for studies in Bachelor's and Master's programmes of study, and the FAD JEPU Study and examination code for studies in doctoral programmes of study. These codes precisely define all procedures and rules for students and teachers"⁸⁰.

In following the rules outlined above, the Faculty have aligned the assessment methods to learning and teaching formats⁸¹. For the PhD programme, the submission contains 80 pages as a written thesis and a body of practice, which is then discussed at the viva voce.⁸²

Students commented on the fact that they receive syllabus, which it details the requirements and programme exams timeframe.⁸³ The method for assessment is contained in the 'Study and Examination rules for Studying BA and MA programmes in JEPU', Article 9.⁸⁴

In relation to studio assessment there is moderation through the assessment process, with Heads of Studio leading the end of year viva examinations. This is supported by external panel members, who are invited into the assessment process. However, there is no clear reflection or paperwork available over the actual moderation that takes place through this process.

The grading is outlined in detail in the SER. It states the following:

"Students are evaluated either by means of credits without grading or by exams. The Faculty uses a system of grades on a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 is the best result and 4 means that the student has to repeat the exam. In case of studio work evaluation, even finer point scale from 12 (best) to 0 (worst) is used. 12 to 10 points = 1, 9 to 7 p. = 2, etc.). This however serves only for the internal need for more accurate distinction between individual students in individual aspects of their work. The Faculty does not use the ECTS system with a wider scale of A-F grading".⁸⁵

There are different approaches to feedback across the Fine Arts programme, from written feedback within the theoretical studies courses, to one-to-one feedback through tutorial mechanisms. Although written feedback on studio course is rare, particularly after the final defence of the work in assessment. Students commented that there are different practices depending on teachers and on each specific subject (more often critical subjects rather than studio).⁸⁶ Clarity of formative assessment procedures would benefit the student's progression towards summative assessment, whilst giving the student a

⁸⁰ SER p.20

⁸¹ Annex 6 Study and Examination rules for Studying BA and MA programmes in JEPU Article 9 and Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes

⁸² Meeting 7 with Research Staff and Students

⁸³ Meeting 3 with BA Students

⁸⁴ Annex 6 Study and Examination rules for Studying BA and MA programmes in JEPU

⁸⁵ SER p.21

⁸⁶ Meeting 3 with BA Students

clear indication of their own progression. Clear written summative feedback would also help in enabling a student to understand the assessment process and reasons behind the award of a grade.

Comments, commendations, and recommendations for improvement for Standard 2.3

Recommendations:

- The Faculty should develop a constructively aligned framework within the Fine Arts programme including the development of learning outcomes, assessment criteria which should contribute to increasing clarity and transparency around the mode of assessment, for each level. This documentation would need to be clearly accessible to students and staff to enhance the levels of consistency and fairness in a transparent and supportive way. (17)
- The generation of clear learning outcomes for courses within programmes to assure the quality of the learning and assessment processes, by which the students understand what they will be assessed against (or for that matter how an academic will assess the studio-based work at the end of the year – thus currently making this process very subjective). These learning outcomes should also define the level learning for the student, whilst also enabling staff to develop a set of criteria by which assessment (at level appropriate stages) can be undertaken. (18)
- Set criterion should be established for assessment by the ‘final jury’ at the programme level, ensuring that the assessment criteria is aligned with the objectives and learning outcomes of each course and programme. (19)
- The Faculty should define the process through which participation of external staff, as the model of external examiners takes place, in order to enable more assured quality mechanisms and processes. (20)
- The Faculty should formalise a feedback process for students in the Fine Arts programmes, which aligns to the criteria for each course and programme level. The final assessment should use a set classification, for which definition of achievement is given at each level. (21)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **non-compliant** in Standard 2.3 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3).

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 Fine Arts programme appears to have clear and appropriate criteria for admission and meets the standards with regards to the admission and entrance qualification. However, as noted in Section 1 of this report, a more strategic approach for recruitment, drawing on the areas of strength of the Faculty, would be of benefit.

The first formal requirement to be able to apply to a BA level of education in the Fine Arts programme, is the passing of the secondary school examination. On the MA level it is necessary to have completed a BA degree. If these formal requirements are met, the admission agenda for new students is carried out in a two-phase procedure which encompasses first a completion of artistic homework and later an on-site examination⁸⁷. This examination is composed of a theoretical written exam that intends to test the applicant's knowledge on Art History and Theory of Art, whereas the practical exercises are meant to examine their artistic talent⁸⁸. In addition to these theoretical and practical tests, the applicants must complete oral interviews with advisors.

Interviews and practical tests are undertaken and examined by the representatives of the studios (Head of Studios and assistants) to which the prospective students apply. Art Theory and Art History tests are examined by members of these departments.⁸⁹

On a doctoral level the formal requirement is the completion of an MA degree. Applicants must then prove quality of the submitted doctoral project and ability of critical reflection and theoretical cogitation in relation to the selected topic.⁹⁰ The admission procedure for PhD candidates consists of a proposal presentation in presence of a committee of members of the subject-area board.

Comments, commendations, and recommendations for improvement for Standard 3.1

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **fully compliant** in Standard 3.1 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 3.1 and 3.2).

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

Students discuss their progression weekly with the student group from their studios, the Head of Studio and assistants. One to one tutorials with Heads of Studio or other tutors are scheduled according to the

⁸⁷ SER p.22

⁸⁸ SER p.22

⁸⁹ SER p.22

⁹⁰ SER p.22

specific needs⁹¹. At the end of each semester students present their outcomes in an assessment, 'studio defence'. Departments and studios also observe the student's achievements outside the academic setting, such as in exhibitions, awards and competitions. These activities are recorded by teachers, studios and information is kept with the Faculty⁹². The most important activities are also recorded in the nationwide Register or Artistic Outputs.

The Fine Arts BA and MA programmes admission procedure takes into consideration the level of knowledge from students, and includes their prior practice work or study experience, talent and ability⁹³. In addition, it was highlighted at meetings that international students have been given opportunities to study within FAD with a certified recognition of their prior learning.⁹⁴

The Faculty does not keep record of their graduate's activities through an official data-collection system. Like much of the internal communication, information around alumni's employment is transmitted through personal contact between former students and staff, which leads to an inaccurate form of data-collection.⁹⁵

The University monitors unemployment of graduates through the portal of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of Czech Republic⁹⁶. Based on this data-register the unemployment of the Faculty has been proved very low in the last years. However, this data does not keep track of whether the alumni are employed in their former field of study.

Alumni are proved to be employed in creative industries ranging from advertisement agencies to design studios, industrial and global companies as well as galleries and state collection institutions. Alumni are also employed by the Faculty to collaborate as tutors, reviewers, members of evaluation boards for final assessments, designers, participants in conferences and exhibitions organised by the Faculty, and as leaders of workshops and seminars.

Graduates contribute to the enhancement of cultural life locally, nationally and internationally by participating in the programmes of the House of Arts and the Hraničář Public Hall in Ústí nad Labem. Alumni run small independent galleries, are active in socially engaged work and participate in national and international exhibitions and competitions of Design and Art⁹⁷. The Faculty is in preparation of a dedicated section on their website to promote successful activities of their alumni.⁹⁸

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 3.2

Commendations:

- The Review Team commends the Faculty for its openness and accessibility to Deans, Vice-Deans, Heads of Departments and Heads of Studios, which create opportunities for collaboration and

⁹¹ Meeting 5 with Teachers

⁹² Meeting 8 with Technical and Support Staff

⁹³ SER p.22

⁹⁴ Meeting 7 with Research Staff and Students

⁹⁵ SER p.23

⁹⁶ SER p.24

⁹⁷ Meeting 11 with Senior Management

⁹⁸ Meeting 8 with Technical and Support Staff

sharing of good practices. This also contributes to the empowerment, particularly of MA and PhD students, as this openness enables them to lead on projects and to be included in all facets of the Faculty. (4)

- The Review Team commends the Faculty for opening a public gallery, the '*House of Arts*', which contributes to developing the engagement with the cultural life in the city. In particular for involving the community of students and associated graduates in this project. (5)
- The Review Team commends the Faculty for the high involvement of alumni in their activities, ensuring long-duration relationships and work experience for graduates. This includes encouraging and supporting exhibition activities for students and alumni. (6)

Recommendations:

- Based on previous recommendations, and as the Faculty formalises a feedback processes for students in the Fine Arts programmes, the final assessment (jury defence) should use a set classification, for which definition of achievement is given at each level. The Faculty should build upon the openness and accessibility of staff through strategic planning, evaluation and moderation in order to ensure greater levels of parity across all staff and students. (22)
- The Faculty should collect and assess data more systematically in order to contribute to defining the profile of students that apply for entry, as well as defining their equal opportunities policy. Analysis should be carried out also to identify the reasons for students to drop-out in the early stages of their programmes. More consistent data collection process in relation to alumni and their employment opportunities would be of benefit, as this could feed into the regular quality review of procedures as well as teaching and learning strategies within the Fine Arts programmes. (23)
- The development of internal processes for tracking graduates' employability patterns. This would contribute to the Faculty retaining connection with their alumni, which currently takes place in a more informal manner. (24)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **partially compliant** in Standard 3.2 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 3.1 and 3.2).

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

Recruitment is carried out in compliance with The Higher Education Act.⁹⁹ According to the SER:

*'An applicant must meet basic requirements for education in an art discipline. However, the most important criterion is the applicant's own creative work itself, which they demonstrate in their portfolio, as well as their vision for teaching and development of their discipline. The applicant's internationally oriented perspectives are also assessed.'*¹⁰⁰

Detailed guidelines for the recruitment procedure are outlined in the supplementary, excerpt document: *Rules for the selection procedure for academic staff of Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem*¹⁰¹. Qualifications and conditions relating to each category of academic staff are also outlined in more detail in the UJEP Staff Working Regulations.¹⁰²

Specialist pedagogical education does not seem necessary for FAD's teaching staff.¹⁰³ The Faculty focus is embedded around the artistic knowledge as a practitioner of art, rather than a facilitator for learning. Meetings between the review team and Teaching and Research staff as well as student groups indicated that the practice and experience of the teaching staff were the most important elements in ensuring quality teaching. In instances where PhD students were engaged in teaching within the Faculty there is no formal training for this, as noted by a representative of the research student group¹⁰⁴. However, PhD students are required to write a syllabus for their teaching activities, which is checked by their PhD supervisor¹⁰⁵. There is no specific training for supervisors and the suitability for the role of supervisor is based on professional and pedagogical experience.

The teaching staff's obligations in relation to artistic, pedagogical and research requirements are outlined in the "UJEP Staff Working Regulations".¹⁰⁶ Meetings with teaching staff and with research staff & students revealed that structures surrounding support to meet these obligations need to be addressed.¹⁰⁷ When asked about the amount of time allocated to research activities members of the research staff described the process as "self-managed", pointing out that there is no formal structure in place to indicate to staff how much time should be invested in each activity, e.g. artistic practice, teaching and research.¹⁰⁸

⁹⁹ Annex 7 *The Higher Education Act*

¹⁰⁰ SER 4.1, p, 25

¹⁰¹ Annex 8 *Rules for the selection procedure for academic staff of Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem*

¹⁰² Annex 9 *UJEP Staff Working Regulations Part 2*, p. 2-8.

¹⁰³ SER 4.1 p.25

¹⁰⁴ Meeting 7 with Research Staff and Students

¹⁰⁵ SER p.24

¹⁰⁶ Annex 9 *UJEP Staff Working Regulations Part 2*, p. 2-8.

¹⁰⁷ Meeting 5 with Teachers and Meeting 8 with Research Staff and Students

¹⁰⁸ Meeting 5 with Teachers and Meeting 8 with Research Staff and Students

All of the staff have considerable artistic practices a factor which has a positive influence on student recruitment and retention, according to members of the student and research student groups. There are a number of possible grant streams by which teaching staff can gain institutional support for their artistic and research activities. “The Dean's Directive No. 2/2010 Support of Creative and Pedagogical Activities of Members of the Academic Community of the FAD of JEPU” outlines the process for the distribution of Internal grants to support creative, scientific and artistic activities of members of the academic community¹⁰⁹. The various grant streams are outlined in the appendix report: “Creative Activities Support by the Faculty”, which covers areas such as exhibitions, publications, and staff mobility including attendance at conferences, symposia and international collaboration projects.

A number of staff outlined in the meetings how following the submission of proposals they had received funding for various projects, activities and mobility undertakings¹¹⁰. However, the Review Team recognised a lack of focused implementation in relation to the awarding of financial support for artistic and research activities. A clearer Faculty-based definition of research supported by a detailed vision and mission statement relating to research, would create a strategy for focused funding and resourcing of artistic and research activities. A comprehensive research strategy would structure funding, focus staff development, and ultimately strengthen the way in which research and artistic activities inform teaching practices within the Faculty.

There are no real structured policies in relation to staff development: *The Faculty does not have an explicit strategy for continuous professional development of teachers, however, mainly the Register of Artistic Outputs has recently become a key tool for feedback on how a teacher works in their field.*¹¹¹ This entry in the SER reflects the prevailing view that the professional artistic endeavours of the staff, which are to a great extent carried out in their own time, are sufficient to keep staff informed of contemporary practice. During the meeting with the Heads of Programmes, the Guarantee of Master Study Programme Visual Art (in English) explained that “*within the whole Czech school system time for personal development is very limited and that research generally happens at night or at weekends*”.¹¹²

In relation to staff-development with a focus on teaching and pedagogy, members of the Fine Arts programme teacher’s group explained that there is no official mechanism to support this “it is down to yourself”.¹¹³ However, for those who wish to take this on board by themselves, there are internal grants and also staff can avail of Erasmus. Staff can travel to other institutions and can recruit guest teachers to visit the Faculty.

The dedication of the teaching staff within the Faculty is a real asset and their participation at all levels of the decision-making process is essential. At present teaching staff are involved in a number of the decision-making platforms: The Dean’s College, created from Heads of Department/Studios, Head of Academic Senate and Vice-Deans who meet once a month and have their minutes published to all staff. The Academic Senate deals with the annual financial plan and issues of actual importance, meets once a month and has 4 teacher representatives. The Artistic Board meets 3 times a year and discusses programme development, Grant Committees, Editorial Committees and Department Boards. The meeting with the Heads of Programmes revealed that the Academic Senate was one of the pivotal

¹⁰⁹ Annex 10 *Dean’s Directive on Support of Creative Activities*

¹¹⁰ Meeting 5 with Teachers

¹¹¹ SER 4.1, p. 25

¹¹² Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes.

¹¹³ Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes.

points in the chain of engagement for staff within the Faculty structures (together with the Deans college, or departmental meetings), as it is through the Academic Senate that information reaches up to the Dean from the academic staff and downwards from the Dean to the academic staff.¹¹⁴

The teaching staff are at the core of external activities such as: exhibitions, the production of promotional events and publications, and they play a key role in the organisational structures and curatorial aspects of all of the above. *“Many teachers are also members of boards and committees at other universities and colleges in Czechia and are regularly invited to committees evaluating work of students from other schools. They are also often members of selection committees, grant commissions, competition juries in the field of art in Czechia”.*¹¹⁵ While an “Annual Report on Activities” is produced and made available, what is required are more formal structures where the results of these activities could be analysed and shared with peers and across all levels of the Faculty so that they might contribute to its overall strategic development. Sharing of these experiences is currently conducted on an informal basis.

Engagement in critical reflection among teaching staff is informal and lacks the depth necessary to make a real, substantial contribution to the development of the individual staff or the Faculty as a whole. Staff all have strong artistic practices, make valuable contributions to the region, through external artistic activities and are engaged with artistic organisations at a regional and national levels. Formal reflective structures could contextualise both the individuals and the Faculty within the wider artistic community and begin to inculcate a critically reflective culture among the students. The development of the *House of Art* as a laboratory for testing new ideas across the different disciplines also provides an opportunity to generate a location for critically reflective practices across the Faculty.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 4.1

Commendation:

- The Review Team commends the Faculty’s teaching staff for their high level of public engagement with exhibitions and external event, playing a key role in initiatives taken by staff in the organisational structures and curatorial aspects of such events, which reflect in their own work and that of their students. (7)

Recommendations:

- Staff development programmes should be put in place in relation with specialist pedagogical training, to ensure staff’s understanding of the new educational policy requirements, strategies and benchmark statements, for learning and teaching. (25)
- In order to support the current three-year staff review, a formal annual appraisal process should be introduced, in order to understand and record staff needs, interests, and development opportunities, that include pedagogical activities. (26)

¹¹⁴ Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes

¹¹⁵ SER, 4.1, p, 26

- Formal structures should be put in place in order to indicate to staff how much time should be invested in each activity across artistic practice, teaching and research. This could also include forward planning for sabbatical leave and practice/research-based leave. (27)
- Structures should be put in place to ensure teaching staff and students participation at all levels of the decision-making processes. Broadening the scope and inclusion of teaching staff within internal committee structures would benefit the lines of communication through the institution, whilst broadening the input into these committees within the Faculty as well. Greater levels of student inclusion in committees would also enhance awareness of the student experience. (28)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **substantially compliant** in Standard 4.1 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 4.1 and 4.2).

4.2 Size and composition of the teaching staff body

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

At present, the number of full-time equivalent teaching staff (across all levels is 59). The workload-hours for each level of staff is outlined in the Staff Working Regulations¹¹⁶. Current student-teacher ratios, the level of individualised teaching and teaching and learning practices are based on studio-centred models. While student/teacher ratios appear low and should indicate an adequate provision of teaching staff to cover the current volume and range of disciplines, the meeting with the Heads of Programmes revealed that teaching staff are overstretched in their duties.¹¹⁷ It was also pointed out that the current studio-based model of teaching is significantly individually-based and this creates a challenge in relation to finding time for both staff development and programme development. Currently there is a three-year review of staffing, however, this does not seem adequate in the rapidly developing environment of the Faculty. This strongly implicates that while the number of staff, staff hours, and staff/student ratios may not be the difficulty, how teaching capital is organised and structured, as well as the modes of teaching could certainly be utilised more effectively.

The teaching team composition, whilst looking at gender (and other) equalities issues when recruiting staff, seem to focus upon research or advanced practice excellence, rather than qualities and experience of 'teaching' and the development of pedagogic strategies.

In relation to the experience of teaching staff and its relevance to the current suite of programmes the Faculty needs to remain cognisant of the fact that media-related digital-based programmes, more than any other programmes require constant upgrading of both physical resources and the expertise of their staff. The Faculty is aware that there are difficulties in this area, which are mainly generated by the Faculty's position and the resulting limitations on recruitment policies in relation to staffing the SER states:

¹¹⁶ Annex 11 *Rectors Directive No.3/2014*: pp.1-11

¹¹⁷ Meeting 2 with Heads of Programmes

This situation is currently relatively stable and is sufficient to fulfil all the essential functions of the study programme. On the other hand, there is a problem that hinders building and development of new sites or development of new study subjects where the financial situation of the Faculty does not allow employment of more expert teachers.”¹¹⁸

The SER also reveals that when the opportunity arises:

“..in order to optimize the composition of the Department with regard to the number of subjects taught and their new contents with regard to new accreditation of Bachelor’s and Master’s studies. Some young lecturers have been hired to these positions who are able to cover a wider range of subjects. Pedagogical duties, such as the number of hours taught depending on academic degree (senior lecturer, associate professor, professor), are described in the JEPU Work Rules”¹¹⁹.

Teaching staff seemed appropriate to the areas of study in the Faculty in relation to their knowledge of the subject area, covering the range and volume of the disciplines, as outlined by the Head of the Institution and the Heads of Department (as well as the Teachers themselves).¹²⁰ In relation to experience, tracking the research outputs, whether strictly research or a form of advanced practice, would suggest that the teaching staff are capable and knowledgeable of the specific areas of practice within which they are embedded in the studio. However, this is not a criterion for quality in relation to teaching, the development of curricula activities, or for that matter assessment or feedback.

The SER also indicated that when new subject areas are being developed, on a temporary basis, teaching roles are filled by PhD students,¹²¹ however the nature of how this is carried out was not well define and sometimes contradictory during a number of the meetings. What is clear however is that current recruitment policies both nationally and institutionally are hampering the implementation of effective, appropriate recruitment procedure to adequately support current and future expertise demands. Members of the Senior Management Group indicated that Faculty members are actively involved with the national *Association of Faculties of Art*, which has the potential to act as a lobbying group to make the Ministry aware of challenges in the sector and seek Ministry support to rectify the situation.¹²²

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 4.2

Recommendations:

- The Faculty should explore alternative teaching models, while still maintaining studio-based methodologies. Current studio layouts encourage peer interaction (discussed in more detail in Section 5) and by recognising and utilising these interactions in a more structured way could help developing improved and more efficient teaching and learning practices. (29)
- A greater level of assessment of academic pedagogic quality assurance in relation to the activities involved in teaching should be integral to the development of new modes of teaching to enhance the students learning and experience. (30)

¹¹⁸ SER, p. 27

¹¹⁹ SER, P. 27

¹²⁰ Meeting 1 with Head of Institution, Meeting 5 with teachers and Meeting 11 with Senior Management Group

¹²¹ SER, P. 27

¹²² Meeting 11 with Senior Management Group

- The development of a recruitment policy for new staff should be aligned with a further strategy into the mission of the Faculty and to the development of teaching excellence and quality measures set against this. This should contribute to expanding the breadth of staff pedagogic expertise in line with forthcoming developments (e.g. House of Arts). (31)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **substantially compliant** in Standard 4.2 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 4.1 and 4.2).

5. Facilities, resources and support

5.1 Facilities

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

The current building housing the Faculty, was reconstructed eleven years ago¹²³ and as such has afforded the Faculty the opportunity to produce purpose designed spaces. During the tour of the facilities, the review team observed at first hand general studios, function specific studios (for example drawing studios and 3D modelling and casting studios), workshops for wood and metal, typography, printing, bookbinding, glass sound recording studios and photographic facilities (photo studios and darkrooms).¹²⁴

The general studios were organised in three sections: an area with computers, (although many students rely on their own computers and in some studios the software needs to be improved in order to meet the professional standards), a larger section for idea generation and development and a small breakout area for group discussion and small seminars. Students are not allocated individual, permanent spaces which leads a flexible dynamic use of space, encouraging discourse between students and movement between studios, workshops and activity-specific spaces. It was however noted by the Review Team that the fact that studios are shared by students from all years (both undergraduate and post-graduate), may cause difficulties for new first year students to initially claim their space over the more settled students. Special attention would need to be provided to help new students integrate into the working environment of these shared studio spaces.

Spaces are available to students on an almost unlimited basis and technical staff are available in specialist areas during regular working hours¹²⁵. However, the Review Team was informed during their meetings with student and teacher groups that there is a severe lack of workshop space, storage space,

¹²³ SER p.27

¹²⁴ Meeting 12 Visit to Studios and Workshops

¹²⁵ SER, p. 27

and equipment, which is appropriate for professional world in certain studios (e.g. Textile, Fashion, etc.).

126

Within the SER there is recognition of the fact that the Faculty is under severe pressure to keep pace with the provision of up to date technologies despite the Faculty's ability to raise external funding. The Review Team noted an extensive list of equipment of physical facilities (spaces), equipment and workshop facilities available in the documentation provided by the Faculty.

*Facilities of the FAD. Nevertheless, the development in this sphere is very fast in the professional world, especially in the field of creative industries and the Faculty does not have sufficient and flexible financial resources to acquire the latest state-of-the-art technologies at an adequate pace.*¹²⁷

The difficulty is in part with how raised funds move through the University's bureaucratic system before arriving at the programme for which they are intended to.¹²⁸ During their meeting with the Review Team, members of the Technical and Support Staff outlined that there are often time limits associated with particular purchases and by the time funds arrive the purchase date has lapsed.¹²⁹

Access to funds to keep pace with rapidly developing technology-reliant programmes is critical particularly considering the number of students relying on their own computers, working in studios where software needs to be improved in order to meet the professional standards. It is important to point out that in other areas such as woodworking, metalworking, printing, etc., equipment and facilities were of a high standard.

The Review Team were made aware of varying practices across the Faculty, with some students having to spend a significant amount of their own resources to buy materials, while students in other areas did not incur similar expenses. These differences in practices and access to resources could directly impact on the Faculty's equal opportunities policy and recruitment and therefore, an equitable system of material provision needs to be explored across all discipline areas within the Faculty.

Worthy of separate mention within this section of the report is the proposed developments for the House of Art. This is a city centre arts facility, currently in operation but with plans for major development as both a teaching and learning resource and as a facility to develop public engagement at local, regional, national and international levels.

As a teaching and learning facility, the *House of Art* has the potential to act as a laboratory that brings together and synthesises the various discipline areas within the Faculty; e.g. art practice, curation and areas of visual communication. As a facility for public engagement it can act both as a platform for the students to reach out to the regional public and also as a showcase venue for wider national and international contemporary practices, which will enrich the cultural environment of the region.

¹²⁶ Meeting 3 with BA students, Meeting 4 with MA students and Meeting 5 with Teaching Staff

¹²⁷ SER, p. 28

¹²⁸ SER, p. 28

¹²⁹ Meeting 8 with Technical and Support Staff

The Faculty does not have its own bespoke library facility. The facility is shared across the University and certainly the Faculty would benefit from some library/academic research facility within the Faculty building. At present, every year the Faculty purchases new literature which is then located in the main University Library facility. The Faculty is however currently in the process of creating its own online catalogue of visual art literature which can be accessed through the Faculty website.

The SER states that the Faculty does not make use of “sophisticated VLE systems”.¹³⁰ While *Moodle* has been made available to staff, it has not been used widely. The lack of engagement with Moodle is explained in the SER as not being consistent with the individual approach to teaching.¹³¹ This viewpoint was confirmed by members of the teaching staff during their meeting with the Review Team. At this meeting the Teachers reiterated the belief that personal contact between the teachers and students was the most effective means of communication.¹³² It is certainly the view of the Review Team that clear lines of transparent communication would be greatly enhanced by the use of Moodle and other VLE platforms.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 5.1

Commendations:

- The Review Team commends the Faculty on the quality of certain resources – such as, exhibition spaces, and some specialised workshops (e.g. typography, lithography, bookbinding, glass), as well as the *House of Art* project, which has the potential to become a major resource for the Faculty, the city and the region. (8)
- The Review Team commends the Faculty’s development of its own online catalogue of visual art literature. (9)

Recommendations:

- The Faculty should review its strategy for resourcing the provision of materials. This should include regular audits of workshop space, storage space, and equipment, to ensure ongoing appropriateness, to meet the needs of the professional and practice contexts (e.g. computer hardware and software). (32)
- Special attention should be given to first-year students to ensure that they can adequately engage with shared studio spaces. (33)
- Ongoing access to funds should be organised through more accessible, transparent, fluid mechanisms, aimed at the funding application and implementation processes, to ensure the provision of up-to-date equipment. (34)
- Greater engagement should be achieved in relation with VLEs, in particular *Moodle*, which is already available to Faculty members. (35)

¹³⁰ SER, p, 28

¹³¹ SER, p.28

¹³² Meeting 5 with Teachers

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **fully compliant** in Standard 5.1 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3).

5.2 Financial resources

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

The institution's financial resources are fixed by 92%. The main source is the Ministry of Education and this budget is guaranteed by a fixed contract with 8% resulting from external grants. This ensures relative sustainability for running the programmes, but is mediated by success in two areas, as explained next. The amount of the basic contribution is proportionately determined by two factors, student numbers and compliance with quality indicators, calculated currently at a ratio of 75% : 25% approximately. It is therefore critical for the Faculty to maintain strong student numbers and achieve targets determined by such areas as high standards in creative activities, strong results and high levels of internationalisation and mobility.¹³³ It is also essential for maximising financial resources that budgets and expenditure are linked to quality and enhancement and the review of programmes and courses and a transparent process for financial requirements and resource investment should be implemented and clearly communicated.

Student recruitment and retention are critical factors in the financial stability and sustainability of the Faculty. In relation to quality it was noted by members of the Technical and Support Staff during their meeting with the Review Team that achieving quality targets creates an educational focus within the Faculty's strategy, where emphasis is placed on projects that "have the capacity to generate the necessary points to achieve the resource allocation from the Ministry".¹³⁴

The SER outlines the process for budget approval with the Dean and the Dean's College playing a pivotal role in the distribution and allocation of funds at Faculty level.¹³⁵ The staff including teaching staff, research staff, and technical and support agreed, that although mechanisms existed to apply for funds there was not enough staff involvement in the actual decision-making process itself and areas of the process lacked transparency as a result.¹³⁶

*The Plan for Implementation of the Strategic Plan of the Faculty of Art and Design at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem*¹³⁷, raises a concern that the changing landscape of Public University financing within the Czech Republic makes it difficult to generate a comprehensive long-term plan for financial resourcing. However, the Faculty has prepared an implementation plan which broadly prioritises how it hopes to achieve its strategic targets. The execution of this plan, however, is hampered by the fact that over the past two years the Faculty has been running at a financial deficit and is also

¹³³ SER, p.29

¹³⁴ Meeting 8 with Technical and Support Staff

¹³⁵ SER, p.29

¹³⁶ Meeting 5 with Teachers

¹³⁷ Annex 12 *Plan for Implementation of the Strategic Plan* p.2

impacted on by the fact that visual arts programmes do not have access to funds available to scientific and technological areas.¹³⁸

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 5.2

Recommendations:

- Budgets and expenditure should be linked to the quality and enhancement of teaching and learning activities, and to the review of programmes and courses. Decisions and actions should then be clearly communicated in a transparent manner. (36)
- The Faculty should continue to participate in lobbying at institutional and national level for the recognition of visual arts programmes and the potential increase in their available budgets, in line with scientific and technological development areas. (37)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **substantially compliant** in Standard 5.2 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3).

5.3 Support staff

Standard: the programme has sufficient qualified support staff

During the meeting with the Technical and Support staff the review team were very impressed by their quality and commitment. When they were asked about Faculty's requirements, it was suggested that this should be asked to the students. However, technical and support staff stated that within the existing parameters they were able to make every effort to address all the students' needs.¹³⁹

The SER, however, suggests that support staff recruitment is suffering from the same lack of initiatives also affecting other staff areas. Specialists to service 'new workplaces' have not been recruited and the lack of capacity to do so is very problematic.¹⁴⁰ The SER also makes the point that while the general number of support staff is considered quite high, they have a very wide remit in terms of their duties and often work across a number of support areas.¹⁴¹ In light of the lack of recruitment, the Review Team were particularly pleased to hear of the appointment of new staff members tasked with leading quality assurance and enhancement as well as research, which should contribute to strategic development.

Opportunity for staff development among Technical and Support Staff, while it exists, is at best informal and down to the initiative of the individual staff member.

The Faculty does not organize its own activities aimed at improving qualification of its non-academic staff. However, they have the opportunity to use the services offered occasionally by the University.

¹³⁸ SER p.30

¹³⁹ Meeting 8 with Technical and Support Staff

¹⁴⁰ SER, p.31

¹⁴¹ SER, p.31

*These are mainly language courses, but also work internships in foreign institutions as part of Erasmus+ programme.*¹⁴²

It was confirmed by the support staff during their meeting with the Review Team that the staff development procedure in this area usually involves a staff member identifying a relevant course or workshop and checking in with the Dean to seek permission to pursue the training programme.¹⁴³ The procedure is not formal, transparent or linked to the Faculty's strategic development plans.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 5.3

Commendations:

- The Review Team commends the quality and commitment of the support staff. (10)

Recommendation:

- The provision of a formal initiative for the training and development of non-academic staff, which should be linked to the Faculty's strategic development plans. (38)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **substantially compliant** in Standard 5.3 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3).

¹⁴² SER p.31

¹⁴³ Meeting 8 with Technical and Support Staff

6. Communication, organisation and decision-making

6.1 Internal communication process

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

The Review Team were informed about the Faculty's approach to internal communication, organisation and decision-making through the *Organisational Chart of the FAD at JEPU* and *Self Evaluation Report*¹⁴⁴ and appendix items¹⁴⁵, as well as through meetings with the Head of the Institution, Heads of Programmes, BA and MA students, Teachers, Research Staff and Students and Technical and Support Staff. An additional paper '*Decision Making and Advisory Committees*¹⁴⁶' provided by the Review Co-ordinator, following the Review Team's request for further clarification, was very helpful in giving a fuller picture of communications. It also explained various committees that were referred to by internal panel members during the course of the visit and how these related to the three main meetings that appear on the *Organisational Chart* that was included in the appendix.

The annual *Academic Community* meeting (referred to in '*Decision Making and Advisory Committees*' Appendix) is organised by the chair of the *Academic Senate*, while an online questionnaire provides another opportunity for feedback from all students. The Review Team was informed, through the various meetings by the Dean, Vice Deans and student members of the *Academic Senate*, that the majority of students were not motivated to use these methods to communicate or feedback with the assumption that there were no issues of substance to be raised. This view was not entirely supported by the progression rate. While there may be many practical reasons, outside of the Faculty's control, for students to choose to withdraw from their studies, a more functional and proactive approach to gathering student feedback should provide essential information in relation to the student experience and highlights needs for development.

Beyond attendance to the above-mentioned committees, communication within the Faculty takes place more informally through direct contact with Programme Guarantors, Vice-Deans and the Faculty's Dean. Students and staff have an open approach to communication within the Faculty, with staff responding to student's needs as required. The Review Team noted however, that when students are less able to openly explain issues that may be affecting them, this open communication channels may not be as effective as formal mechanisms to check on student welfare and progress.

The Faculty communicates with staff, hourly paid teaching and non-teaching staff, with external collaborators and students through formal meetings, informal meetings and informal individual communications, possible due to the relatively small scale of the Faculty, and the availability of the executive team who are all engaged in teaching as well as external projects.

The Dean of the Faculty is elected from the teaching team and chooses the Vice Deans and the members of the monthly *Dean's College*, which he chairs. This is a permanent advisory body for key issues relating

¹⁴⁴ Annex 13 *Organisational chart of the FAD at JEPU*

¹⁴⁵ Annex 14 *Constitution of the FAD Article 17, 15, 14, 12 and Internal Governance Code of the FAD*

¹⁴⁶ Annex 15 *Decision Making and Advisory Committees*

to the Faculty's operation and development. The Dean also chairs *the Artistic Board* that meets 3 times a year and is made up of some of the same key senior academics along with eleven external members chosen by the Dean. This meeting focuses on important issues related to the Faculty's academic programmes, annual monitoring, strategic planning and professorship procedures.¹⁴⁷ The third main meeting referred to on the above *Organisational Chart* is the monthly *Academic Senate* that has 11 members with 5 elected Academic members and 6 elected student members. The *Academic Senate* considers both the operational and development matters as well as annual monitoring, strategic planning and issues raised by students. The Dean is frequently invited to attend this meeting to deliver information and answer specific questions raised.¹⁴⁸

Besides these key formal meetings there are the *Department Members Meetings* open to all academic members of the department, a *Subject-Area Board* for PhD studies, with 16 internal members and 6 external members from other institutions, the *Inner Grants Committee* with 5 members of staff appointed by the Dean, the *Editorial Committee* with 7 members of staff appointed by the Dean, *Disciplinary Board of the Faculty* with 3 members appointed by the Dean following approval by the *Academic Senate* and the *Scholarship Committee* with 5 members, with 1 academic, 1 member of the study department and 3 students.¹⁴⁹ There are also occasional *Arbitrary Committees* set up by the Dean as and when required with members chosen according to the area being considered and there is an annual *Academic Community* meeting to which all students and staff are invited.¹⁵⁰

During the review visit, it was evident that the senior leaders within the Faculty undertake a number of roles, for example the Vice Deans are also Heads of Department, and may also teach into specific studios, this currently results in largely the same pool of academics sitting on a number of key meetings. Meanwhile student representation appears to be restricted to the 6 elected student members of the monthly *Academic Senate*.¹⁵¹

Through the information provided and gathered during meetings, the Review Team found that internal communication was effective to an extent with some very positive comments about the sense of community and the openness of the leadership team. This was particularly apparent in the technical and support team meeting where staff spoke eloquently of their sense of belonging and how their contributions were valued. There is, however, a tendency to rely upon the motivation of individuals to stay informed and play an active role in the Faculty's community. There appears to be an assumption that the relatively small scale of the Faculty obviates the need for the more formal systems to be analysed or improved upon. Such an approach risks a lack of inclusion, potentially leading to misinterpretation and a lack of awareness and understanding from members of staff and students.

The student representatives who attended the meetings with the Review Team were mainly highly motivated and engaged and were enthusiastic about their experience at the Faculty, and the studio teaching system appears to work very well for those students who are regularly attending and

¹⁴⁷ Annex 15 *Decision Making and Advisory Committees*

¹⁴⁸ SER p.33

¹⁴⁹ Annex 15 *Decision Making and Advisory Committees*

¹⁵⁰ Annex 15 *Decision Making and Advisory Committees*

¹⁵¹ SER p.32

ambitious. Given the relatively low level of attendance (referred to at some length by one of the student representatives during a tour of the Faculty as well as in the meeting with students¹⁵²) there were no regular and effective methods for capturing best practice and for reliably communicating proposals and ideas between studios and programmes.

One example from the teaching team of a positive change made in response to student feedback was based on the progression from a graduating student onto the teaching team. Following their return to the Faculty as a tutor they instigated a change based on their own experience that had proven to be successful. While this evidenced that the studio in question was responsive to the suggestions of a new tutor, it did not demonstrate effective use of student feedback. Had the tutor in question moved away, and been employed elsewhere, their useful insight would have been lost.¹⁵³

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 6.1

Commendation:

- The Review Team commends the openness of the Faculty and the accessibility of the Dean, Vice Deans, Heads of Department and Heads of Studios which creates opportunities for collaboration, sharing of practices and the empowerment of students. (11)

Recommendations:

- The development of a communication strategy that clearly and transparently outlines procedures for staff and students, indicating remit and composition of committees. This should include clear guidelines for decision-making, for example in the allocation of internal grants. (39)
- The development of more proactive ways of gathering students' views, for example through regularly facilitated student fora and greater inclusion on existing committees to gather, reflect on and act upon student views with the focus based upon enhancement of student experience across all levels. (40)
- The Faculty should share information with the student cohort on how their feedback has generated changes in order to encourage student participation in feedback. (41)
- The development of diagonal working and focus groups, including a range of staff members from both academic and support teams as well as students, should be aimed to consider learning and teaching strategies and develop identified strengths to construct plans for action and share best practice. (42)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **partially compliant** in Standard 6.1 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 6.1 and 6.2).

¹⁵² Meeting 4 with MA Students and Meeting 12 Visit to Studios and Workshops

¹⁵³ Meeting 4 with MA Students

6.2 Organisational structure and decision-making processes

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

As referred to in section 6.1 above, the Faculty is led by a Dean, elected by Faculty members for a term of office of 5 years (re-electable for one further term), who selects the Vice Deans, and members of a number of other committees. The Dean also chairs two of the three main formal channels for decision making. The SER description of the Organisational Structure of FAD was not sufficiently clear and the team requested clarification during the visit, particularly regarding how key strategic decisions were proposed and approved. Further information was made available by the Review Co-ordinator with a new table of meetings made available, '*Decision Making and Advisory Committees*'¹⁵⁴, meanwhile the Dean and co-ordinator also drew diagrams to clarify the connections between the different meetings and individual members of the senior management team. Meetings during the review also referred to other Faculty regular meetings not covered by the documentation, such as the *Financial Meetings* and *Project meetings*. The connection between Faculty meetings and the University was also discussed at the Technical and Support Staff meeting.¹⁵⁵

Given the small scale of the Faculty there were no concerns in relation to decision-making processes for the Fine Arts programmes, raised by members who attended meetings with the Review Team. Moreover, there was a strong sense of ownership of the direction of the Faculty, trust in the decision-making processes and senior management team and an understanding of roles and responsibilities of Deans and Vice-Deans. It did appear, however, through the documentation made available, that there was a lack of a clear and definitive picture of how curriculum development takes place, how decisions are proposed, discussed, consulted, approved and communicated, the timeline for this process and the individuals involved. While the Faculty appears to thrive on a more informal and organic approach, with a high degree of trust in the senior management team, the apparent inability to provide a holistic overview of decision making was of concern.

Staff roles are defined and through the various review meetings it was evident that staff were aware of their general responsibilities and of lines of communication and the overarching organisational and decision-making processes.

It was noted by the Review Team that the meeting with '*Representatives of the Professionals and Employers*' arranged for the review visit was not attended by all of the 11 individuals named on the documentation provided to the Review Team in advance.¹⁵⁶ Instead, four panel members attended the meeting and this included a current PhD student and a member of the Faculty teaching team. This gave limited information on how external input informed decision making. Meanwhile, as described in section 6.1, student involvement in decision making is limited to the six elected student representatives on the *Academic Senate*. While the Review Team has some concerns that student representation is so

¹⁵⁴ Annex 15 *Decision Making and Advisory Committees*

¹⁵⁵ Meeting 8 with Technical and Support Staff

¹⁵⁶ Meeting 9 with Professionals and Employers

limited, it should be noted that informal meetings are also held including an annual 'all student and staff' meeting and the Academic Senate meetings are on a regular monthly basis.

It appears that the Faculty are implementing the governance measures required by the University and following the guidelines as set out in the various governance documents submitted as appendix items. There was limited evidence that the review had been used as an opportunity to test the fitness for purpose of the organisational structure and decision-making processes and the recommendations of the Review Team relate to strengthening this area.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 6.2

Recommendations:

- The Faculty should review its approach to gathering students', staffs' and external representatives' views to ensure that they are informing decision-making adequately. (43)
- Teaching staff, support staff and students should be included at all levels of the decision-making process. Decisions should be transparent and made available to staff and students. An inclusive forum would contribute to the sense of collective thinking in relation to financial planning. (44)
- The national and University policies and regulatory framework should be viewed as a useful and positive opportunity to develop productive internal mechanisms to construct and achieve through internal evaluation, the mission and strategic plans embedded within it. (45)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **partially compliant** in Standard 6.2 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 6.1 and 6.2).

7. Internal Quality Culture

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

The Amendment to the HE Act (2017) has resulted in the Faculty to be fully responsible for evaluating the quality of the institution and study programmes. The information collected and evaluated by the Faculty is compiled in an Annual Report, which is submitted to the University for the development of an Internal Quality Assurance Report. The Faculty's Annual Report is discussed at the Artistic Board, as stated by the SER¹⁵⁷, however, during the review and in line with further documents provided at this time, the review team noted that this is also named the Artistic Board. The SER also points out that the *"Dean is responsible for ensuring and conducting the internal evaluation of quality of activities of the relevant faculty."*¹⁵⁸. Within this context and through the meetings undertaken by the Review Team, it was noted that this process is very centralised and there is little awareness across staff and students of the analysis and results.

An important role in the quality assurance process is that of the 'Programme Guarantor', who is responsible for the teaching and accreditation of the study programmes and the evaluation of teaching practices. In general, the paperwork related to this annual evaluation, including SWOT analyses was available to the Review Team. However, it was more difficult to identify how these processes are helping the range of programmes in the Faculty, including Fine Arts, to reflect over teaching methods, the student experience as well as sharing best practice, due to minimal representation of Faculty members and students in the process.

Over the past few years, the Faculty undertakes student surveys, which also include graduates and alumni. However, during the meetings, members of the Faculty expressed that there is little participation of students in this process, with very low response rates.

The Review Team noted that staff across the Faculty work in an environment based on trust with committed students and staff. The Faculty produced relevant documents related to quality assurance procedures which showcase a strategic approach to embedding these within the teaching programmes, such as *'Study and Examination Codes'*; *'Requirements for Bachelor's Dissertation'* and *'Examination Rules for Master's Study Programmes'*¹⁵⁹; *'Qualification Requirements for Thesis Supervision'*¹⁶⁰. However, and although key policies and strategies that are in place help the Review Team understand the direction the Faculty aims to take, it is essential that these are further reviewed in order to ensure they are the supportive building blocks for the Faculty to develop and build their quality culture, both for the institution and for their study programmes, including Fine Arts. Within this context, it is essential that the work of the Faculty in relation to their quality culture moves away from compliancy to an integrated enhancement policy.

¹⁵⁷ SER: p. 35

¹⁵⁸ SER: p. 35

¹⁵⁹ Annex 16 *Study and Examination Code of Study in Doctoral Programmes* and Appendix 6 *Study and Examination Code of Study in BA and MA Programmes*

¹⁶⁰ Annex 17 *Qualification Requirements for Thesis Supervision*

The Faculty undertakes a quality review of their programme annually where information is compiled in the Annual Report. The Faculty also develops a Self-Evaluation Report every five years, “ *which includes a broader framework of institutional analysis. These reports are discussed by the University’s Internal Evaluation Board and submitted to the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic*”¹⁶¹

The programme-level Annual Reports at the Faculty are undertaken by Programme Guarantors, whereas the five-yearly Self-Evaluation Reports are led by the Dean in consultation with the Dean’s College. The results are discussed and analysed by the Faculty Management, which includes Deans and Vice-Deans, the Dean’s College, which includes Deans, Vice-Deans, Heads of Departments and the President of the Academic Senate. The reports are also available to each individual department and within the programmes of studies. However, the most significant leadership within this process remains with the Dean and the Dean’s College.

Although the reports are presented at the Artistic Board, the role of this Board in assessing the data or in suggesting changes was clear during the review. A role seems to be given to the examination processes, particularly in relation to the learning outcomes of courses and programmes, which may lead to confusing sets of data. Success is also measured in relation to student’s completion rates and public engagement of staff across art and design-related activities within the city.

The Faculty has in place a process for quality self-evaluation, engaging with staff, students and occasionally key stakeholders. However, further attention could be given to the ways in which enhancement procedures are embedded within formal systems. Currently the work of the Faculty seems to rely on committed staff members and students to inform necessary changes and strengthen the delivery of study programmes. The Review Team has observed that this has not fully taken place so far

The Faculty uses the following metrics for programmes

- number of applications, of students admitted and enrolled
- structure of applicants in the admission procedure (gender, age, nationality, school)
- structure of students (gender, age, nationality)
- number of students that completed and those unsuccessful in their study programme
- results of the final examinations
- study success rate (from a given cohort - by semesters) and average length of study
- grade-point average
- continuity of studies (where do students continue/where do students come into the post-graduate programme from)
- structure of academic staff
- number of outbound and inbound mobility (student-day)
- proportion of graduates who have completed a foreign internship
- foreign institutions which students travel to/foreign institutions from which students arrive
- countries which students travel to/countries from which students arrive

¹⁶¹ SER: pp. 35

- subjects taught in English

The Review Team identified the above metrics through supporting documentation. However, it was not so clear during the visit and meetings, how these metrics are analysed and how this analysis generates action and change at the management and programme levels. In addition, information was not provided in relation to benchmark targets to measure the level of success of programmes and the Review Team were informed at meetings that these do not exist.

At all meetings undertaken by the Review Team, staff members of the Faculty, students, alumni and stakeholders expressed that they had not been consulted in the preparation of the SER. They had not been engaged in writing or invited to contribute to the evaluation process. Regarding current quality procedures at the Faculty, as expressed above, these involve a reduced number of members of staff and students. Processes are centralised and do not tend to consult (formally) the wider group of academics and students at the Faculty. However, it is clear that the Faculty generates an open and trustworthy environment where staff and students feel proximity to their peers and communication flows openly.

Student surveys are undertaken by the Faculty, but these have very low response rates. Alumni are consulted on some occasions, but this information is not structured around quality processes. According to the discussions at the Review Team's meetings external stakeholders are consulted when they participate from examination procedures or, on an informal basis, in relation to forthcoming plans for the Faculty, such as the *House for Art*.¹⁶²

Decision-making is led by the Dean and the Dean's College. In relation to quality assurance, some recommendations are taken at the level of the Artistic Board, which meets three times per year and focuses on annual reports, strategic planning, and professorship procedures. It is not clear however, on the documentation received by the Review Team and through the meetings undertaken during the visit, the exact process in which quality assurance procedures inform decision-making.

The senior management team informed the Review Team that the process for staff and students being informed of changes is currently informal and led by the openness and accessibility to staff within the Faculty.¹⁶³ Responsibility for quality assurance and enhancement remains within the senior management boards (Dean's College and Artistic Board).

At the meetings during the review visit, both students and staff they informed the Review Team that they were not made aware of the impact of their feedback through formal procedures nor the changes made as a result.¹⁶⁴ At most meetings with management or teaching staff teams, the low response rates and the lack of information provided by this process was noted. However, staff and students pointed out that staff Faculty members are usually accessible, and they can discuss any problems or issues through meetings and more informal channels.

¹⁶² Meeting 9 with Professions and Employers

¹⁶³ Meeting 11 with Senior Management Group

¹⁶⁴ Meeting 3 with BA Students, Meeting 4 with MA Students and Meeting 5 with Teachers

Feedback to students is something that the Faculty needs to address, in essence it is not just how the Faculty feeds back to students, but also how it shows students are given the opportunity to comment on progress, change and developments to be made to the learner journey, outside of one-to-one feedback to studio staff.

The Review Team identified that although quality processes are in place, these are not fully embedded within the reflective approach of the Faculty. A quality culture should be sought and systems should be in place for this to be achieved (please note specific recommendations in section 7 of this report).

There is a very strong bond between stakeholders and the Faculty, as well as between students and academic staff, all committed to making the Faculty a nationally (and potentially internationally) renowned arts community. A focused transition will take time, but the Review Team trusts that by strategically interconnecting the mission of the Faculty in relation to research, education and public engagement with quality and enhancement procedures, will bring real benefit if this allows for reflection over strategic drivers and operational aspects of the Faculty.

According to the quality accreditation review by the Czech Ministry of Education and under the new *Amendment to the HE Act 2017* the Faculty has responsibility for and has to carry out regular annual evaluation reviews of the quality of art, science and research, development and innovation or other creative activity. It is clear that the Faculty has systems in place to achieve this, however, quality procedures should ensure that necessary changes are undertaken and more importantly a shift in focus towards an enhanced student experience is sought.

External professionals (other than those involved in teaching), are not involved directly with strategic developments within the Faculty, however they are involved in the Artistic Board. It is unclear how external quality assurance experts are involved in either benchmarking or Faculty developments.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 7

Commendation:

- The Review Team commends the ambition in the quality procedures in place as well as the commitment and dedication of staff and the engagement of postgraduate students. (12)
- The Faculty for its commitment to the assessment of quality assurance of their programmes through set up annual and five-annual processes. (13)

Recommendations:

- The Faculty's quality policy processes should be strengthened in alignment with the new rules and regulations stated in the *Amendment Act* and with the intention to include all aspects of the Faculty's teaching, research and public engagement activity in order to ensure that this system provides a useful tool for assessment and reflection. (46)
- The development of an inclusive, coherent and enhanced quality culture through proactively taking ownership of quality assurance and enhancement processes, in line with the University's

and national standards. This will create a useful and constructive tool for self-evaluation (including staff, students, alumni, external stakeholder), that helps identify strengths, weaknesses and opportunities to enhance the faculty mission across the three core areas: Education, Research and Social Responsibility. (47)

- The Faculty should employ quality assurance and enhancement annual reporting as a way of evaluating and monitoring activities, such as: proposed benchmarks, the Faculty's alignment with mission and the quality of student experience. (48)
- As the Faculty incorporates quality assurance procedures, a wider representation of Faculty members is included in the development of the paperwork, particularly the self-evaluation document, including student consultation in the process. Both qualitative and quantitative data should be used for the quality review and evaluation process with considerations over the possible introduction of more qualitative data. (49)
- The development of a comprehensive Academic Quality Handbook that could help staff, students and external stakeholders to understand internal procedures and identify opportunities for participation in this reflection. (50)
- The establishment of a series of seminars/workshops (in coordination with the University) for of staff, student, alumni and stakeholders, aimed at generating a common understanding of the quality procedures, with particular emphasis on the local benefits for each programme (e.g. Fine Arts) and on identifying opportunities for the range of contributions from all the above groups to these processes. (51)
- The Faculty should produce guidelines and templates for Study Programme Review reports, as a way of evaluating and monitoring activities, in alignment with their mission and reflecting over the quality of the student experience. These should clearly explain the quality review cycle, including how the reflection undertaken through the review process will generate the implementation of necessary changes, and how the participants in this review (e.g. staff and students) will be informed of any changes generated by their comments and suggestions. (52)
- The Faculty should define qualitative and quantitative metrics, which should include expected targets at the institutional and study programme level. These should be mapped against quality reviews (five-yearly and annual) and should help the development of benchmarks and targets for the institution and for their study programmes, at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. (53)
- Although the Faculty showcases openness and accessibility to Deans, Vice-Deans, Heads of Departments and Heads of Studios, this should be built upon internal quality and enhancement structures to create further opportunities for collaboration and sharing of best practice. (54)

- Considering that MA and PhD students tend to lead on projects, linking teaching and practice, the review team recommends that this is more carefully structured in order to enable greater levels of parity, through strategic planning, evaluation and moderation, as well as quality processes that include all staff and students. (55)
- The Faculty should provide formal feedback to students and staff on changes made as a result of their feedback. This is likely to help raising response rates as the groups consulted will understand how their comments are considered by the Faculty. (56)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **partially compliant** in Standard 7 for the study programme *Fine Arts*.

8. Public interaction

8.1 Cultural, artistic and educational contexts

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

The Faculty is proactive and fully engaged in public interaction and the Review Team recognised that Social Responsibility is deeply important to the Faculty and one of its three core activities (Education, Research and Social Responsibility). This was evident in the SER, in many of the review meetings with different groups. This commitment was also manifested in the range of posters for public events seen by the Review Team, the publications produced by the Faculty's own publishing house, documenting the work of staff and students, as well as the work of the *House of Art* project, a central city located art space open to the public that the review team was able to visit.

There was evidence of a high level of engagement in external, public facing projects from both staff and students and a sense in which such external projects are deeply embedded within the curriculum. The meeting with professionals and employers included a gallerist based in the city who works directly with students as interns, as well as with graduates. The group spoke about how important the Faculty has been, and continues to be, in bringing contemporary visual culture to the city, and how it has effectively been the agent for significant change, education of the public in the arts and engaged local people to help with social concerns.¹⁶⁵

The range of external activities available to students and the staff activity used as case studies embedded in the curriculum offers those students involved opportunities to engage in society and to employ their skills and understanding as effective agents for change. It was less apparent how the effectiveness of such opportunities was monitored, and how parity of experience was assured, beyond anecdotal evidence, which was referred to during the meeting with professionals and employers.

The new plans for the *House of Art*, presented to the Review Team during a tour of the facilities, appear very ambitious and have now achieved funding from the government. This new development will support the Faculty to expand the facility to include spaces for Artists in Residence, public engagement projects, public lectures as well as providing a major exhibition and performance space.

While Prague already has an active cultural scene, the Faculty has evidently been working hard to create and enrich the cultural context of Usti for its students, staff and local people. It is clear that a great deal of energy and commitment has gone into this enterprise and the review team were impressed by the scale and meaningfulness of these activities.

Since this is a Quality Review, it would have been useful to have seen more formal evaluative and monitoring processes, to support the ambitious plans and to ensure relevance and effectiveness of the strategy. Some recommendations related to other key headings are equally relevant here.

¹⁶⁵ Meeting 9 with Professions and Employers

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 8.1

Commendation:

- The Review Team commends the ambition of the Faculty's endeavours particularly in relation to social engagement and Internationalisation and the energy with which the Faculty has worked within the city and the region to develop the artistic community and public awareness and use of contemporary arts. (14)

Recommendation:

- The development of diagonal working groups aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of the *House of Art* project and other public facing initiatives, to ensure that new developments fully build on lessons learned while also sharing best practice evolving a toolkit that students and staff may go on to employ for other initiatives. (57)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **fully compliant** in Standard 8.1 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3).

8.2 Interaction with the artistic professions

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

The Faculty engages with the wider creative industries and artistic professions in the region through projects such as the *House of Art* and through their own professional practice.

From the series of review meetings with the Dean, Vice Deans, Tutors, Technicians, Theoreticians and administrators, it was evident that the Faculty has a high proportion of practising artists employed as teaching staff, who also participate for project management. This was further evidenced by the range of publications of the artistic work of Faculty members available for the review team during the 3-day visit to the Faculty. This understanding of the practicalities, theoretical, ethical and professional dilemmas of artistic practice at all levels of the Faculty works to inform and shape the curriculum, structures and decision making, and appears to also fuel the Faculty's commitment to public engagement and collaboration with the wider artistic community.

Because the Faculty has been so active in establishing the arts eco system in the city, the review team were informed through the meetings with tutors, the senior management team and the employers and professionals as well as with MA students, that alumni are prepared to work with the Faculty following graduation, either as tutors or technicians or as locally based gallerists, project directors and artists, providing current students and graduates with professional practice opportunities.

The members of the professionals, students and staff panels spoke with enthusiasm about the opportunities for engagement with the wider arts community and arts professionals facilitated by the Faculty. It was evident that there were well established and productive links that will be built upon with the new *House of Art* project already mentioned.

From the Quality Review perspective it was less evident that activities were systematically monitored and the tendency for the Faculty to work with alumni, while positive in providing professional opportunities and ensuring that artists stay in the area, could also be seen as potentially leading to an insular community, in this way it was less clear how the Faculty assessed and monitored the ongoing needs of the professions in any formal way apart from their regular interactions through project activities.

There is no explicit strategy to promote Lifelong Learning or to evaluate the effectiveness of the Faculty's approach in this regard.

It was evident however that because the Faculty's academic community is made up of active practitioners, who are engaged themselves in a process of lifelong learning, there is an inherent promotion of lifelong learning embedded within the studio model, as well as through the live projects and the role of the Head of Studio as an artistic mentor. There appeared to be a culture of lifelong learning and an implicit understanding that artistic practices were never static, and learning was a lifelong commitment.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 8.2

Recommendation:

- The development of working groups, where required, aimed to evaluate and monitor the Faculty's effectiveness in addressing the ongoing needs of the artistic professions and the currency of the curriculum. The findings could support annual programme monitoring and strategic planning. (58)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **substantially compliant** in Standard 8.2 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (see Section 9 for compliance of 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3).

8.3 Information provided to the public

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

The Faculty's main platform for promotion of its courses and for informing the public of its activities are its website and a printed and online prospectus. During the 3-day visit the Review Team members considered this material together with the research publications and posters produced by the Faculty's own publishing house. The research material was considered to be of a high quality and related to the Faculty's focus on social engagement and supporting staff members with their artistic professional practice. The availability of this material together with the website and prospectus provides the public with an accurate insight into the workings of the Faculty.

For students enrolled on the courses the virtual learning environment sets out to provide guidance on course structure, deadlines and specialist learning information and this was made available during the visit and used by members of the review team to see how information was organised. It appeared to be

largely comprehensible and functioning well though there remained some concern regarding the effective use of learning outcomes as is referenced earlier in the report in relevant recommendations.

Information given to the public is checked for consistency by the administrative team and is the overall responsibility of the senior management team including the Dean. The support team who attended the review meetings appeared very well informed about the course content and structures and what was available for students and there was evidence of a proactive approach from the administrative and support teams in ensuring that they are fully informed about the courses as well as the future plans of the Faculty.

The Dean as mentioned above is also a tutor and involved at all levels in the planning and delivery of programmes at the Faculty and is fully aware of the content of the programmes from both perspectives. With information screened by both the senior management team and those who use it regularly to inform applicants, students and other audiences, there is assurance of its accuracy.

As referred to above, information given to the public is checked for consistency by the administrative team and is the overall responsibility of the senior management (executive) team including the Dean. The organisational structure does not appear to include a formal sign off of information.

As referred to above, information given to the public is checked for consistency by the administrative team and is the overall responsibility of this team including the Dean. Any updates to information for the website are generated through the executive team and updates to the Virtual Learning Environment are applied by key administrators.

When members of the staff teaching groups were questioned about their use of the *University's Ethical Codex* referred to in the *Self Evaluation Report*, it became apparent that the assumption that the *University's Ethical Codex* was a key reference and used to check material before it was published was inaccurate. The Review Team were not assured that ethical considerations were formally addressed though there were no issues raised by the material reviewed.

Comments, commendations and recommendations for improvement for Standard 8.3

Commendation:

- The Review Team commends the development of an internal publishing house and the quality of publications on staff and student projects produced. (15)

Recommendation:

- The development of guidance outlining responsibilities and processes for the approval of public information, particularly the website and for the Virtual Learning Environment. (59)

The Review Team find that FAD at Purkyne University is overall **fully compliant** in Standard 8.3 for the study programme *Fine Arts* (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 1-6
<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.	Partially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 7-13
<i>Standard 2.2</i> The programme offers a range of opportunities for students to gain an international perspective.	Substantially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 14-16
<i>Standard 2.3</i> Assessment methods are clearly defined and demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes	Non-compliant	Refer to Recommendations 17-21
<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.	Partially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 22-24
<i>Standard 4.1</i> Members of the teaching staff are qualified for their role and are active as artists/pedagogues/researchers.	Substantially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 25-28
<i>Standard 4.2</i> There are sufficient qualified teaching staff to effectively deliver the programmes.	Substantially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 29-31
<i>Standard 5.1</i> The institution has appropriate resources to support student learning and delivery of the programme.	Fully compliant	Refer to Recommendations 32-35
<i>Standard 5.2</i> The institution's financial resources enable successful delivery of the study programmes.	Substantially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 36-37

<i>Standard 5.3</i> The programme has sufficient qualified support staff.	Substantially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 38
<i>Standard 6.1</i> Effective mechanisms are in place for internal communication within the programme.	Partially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 39-42
<i>Standard 6.2</i> The programme is supported by an appropriate organisational structure and clear decision-making processes.	Partially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 43-45
<i>Standard 7</i> The programme has in place effective quality assurance and enhancement procedures.	Partially compliant	Refer to Recommendations 46-56
<i>Standard 8.1</i> The programme engages within wider cultural, artistic and educational contexts.	Fully compliant	Refer to Recommendations 57
<i>Standard 8.2</i> The programme actively promotes links with various sectors of the music and other artistic professions.	Substantially compliant	Refer to Recommendation 58
<i>Standard 8.3</i> Information provided to the public about the programme is clear, consistent and accurate.	Fully compliant	Refer to Recommendations 59

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 ambition of the Faculty's mission, particularly in relation to social engagement and internationalisation and the energy with which the Faculty works within the city and the region to promote and develop the artistic community at local and regional levels.
2. The Review Team acknowledges and commends the work carried out in the development of the new benchmark statements for programmes (BA and MA levels).
3. The Review Team commends the institution on how the students are given opportunities to present their work at national and international events, as well as to include their work in current Faculty's publications.
4. The Review Team commends the Faculty for its openness and accessibility to Deans, Vice-Deans, Heads of Departments and Heads of Studios, which create opportunities for collaboration and sharing of good practices. This also contributes to the empowerment, particularly of MA and PhD students, as this openness enables them to lead on projects and to be included in all facets of the Faculty.
5. The Review Team commends the Faculty for opening a public gallery, the '*House of Arts*', which contributes to developing the engagement with the cultural life in the city. In particular for involving the community of students and associated graduates in this project.
6. The Review Team commends the Faculty for the high involvement of alumni in their activities, ensuring long-duration relationships and work experience for graduates. This includes encouraging and supporting exhibition activities for students and alumni.
7. The Review Team commends the Faculty's teaching staff for their high level of public engagement with exhibitions and external event, playing a key role in initiatives taken by staff in the organisational structures and curatorial aspects of such events, which reflect in their own work and that of their students.
8. The Review Team commends the Faculty on the quality of certain resources – such as, exhibition spaces, and some specialised workshops (e.g. typography, lithography, bookbinding, glass), as well as the *House of Art* project, which has the potential to become a major resource for the Faculty, the city and the region.
9. The Review Team commends the Faculty's development of its own online catalogue of visual art literature.
10. The Review Team commends the quality and commitment of the support staff.
11. The Review Team commends the openness of the Faculty and the accessibility of the Dean, Vice Deans, Heads of Department and Heads of Studios which creates opportunities for collaboration, sharing of practices and the empowerment of students.
12. The Review Team commends the ambition in the quality procedures in place as well as the commitment and dedication of staff and the engagement of postgraduate students.
13. The Faculty for its commitment to the assessment of quality assurance of their programmes through set up annual and five-annual processes.
14. The Review Team commends the ambition of the Faculty's endeavours particularly in relation to social engagement and Internationalisation and the energy with which the Faculty has worked within the city and the region to develop the artistic community and public awareness and use of contemporary arts.
15. The Review Team commends the development of an internal publishing house and the quality of publications on staff and student projects produced.

Recommendations for further development

1. The educational purpose of the Faculty's mission should be strengthened, and a stronger alignment should be achieved with strategic planning across research, learning and teaching, public engagement and the development of a quality and assurance culture, broadly at the Faculty and within the Fine Arts programmes.
2. The degree programmes need to clearly define their specific aims in relation to the Faculty's mission and more qualitative data should be collected and used in this process.
3. The employment of a constructively aligned learning outcome and assessment strategy, with considered benchmarks for each level of the programmes, BA, MA and PhD, will benefit the student experience and provide assurance of the quality of assessment. Evaluating the learner journey from application to graduation will be important in this context. This could be achieved through the development of a *learning and teaching working group*, with the key task of aligning the benchmark statements around Intended Learning Outcomes and Assessment Criteria of the Fine Arts programmes.
4. Employing annual reporting as a way of evaluating and monitoring activities, the Faculty's alignment with its mission and the quality of the student experience. This may include proactively taking ownership of the University's processes to create a useful and constructive tool for self-evaluation that helps identify strengths, weaknesses and opportunities to enhance the Faculty mission across the three core areas.
5. The Faculty should develop a recruitment strategy that looks across all Fine Art programmes in order to encapsulate strengths, whilst enabling clear recording of student numbers, student offer targets against actual targets, whilst constructing an approach to marketing the programmes that is embedded within the context of the overall mission.
6. A more contextualised overview of student retention (and also of the quality of the student experience), through the organisation of feedback fora, questionnaires and methods for students to raise any issues within the Faculty and provide suggestions that may lead to strategic development.
7. To review, re-think and clearly define 'student-centred learning', which should relate not only to student's opportunities for independent development, but also consider their involvement in defining learning outcomes, assessment structures, study pathways, etc.
8. Participation from stakeholders should be more clearly embedded in the development of the curriculum for the programmes of studies – the '*Programme/Degree Review Board*' that has recently been set up is a good step towards this. Clear guidelines, including quality indicators that the institution requires, should be given to programme leaders (Guarantors) and stakeholders to understand the purpose of this feedback exercise.
9. Student's expected achievements at each level and the links between levels in study programmes should be clearly set up and presented in detail as well as communicated through programme specification documents. The development of critical reflection and its alignment to the studio will enable students to understand in greater depth their progression and learning through their levels of study.
10. A staff development policy around 'teaching as a practice' should be put in place. This should influence teaching methods and help to develop the academic/educational framework around constructive alignment and quality assurance of processes within the BA and MA curricula.
11. More flexible study pathways consistent across all programmes of studies should be developed, which the new building and carefully considered programme review structures should contribute to.
12. Greater levels of research and critical reflection with the incorporation of more evident alignments between research and practice within studio courses ILO's and therefore with assessment at the end of the studio courses.
13. Enhancing the clarity of the role of research within the educational strategy and its importance in relation to curriculum development, as well as the interrelationship between learning, teaching and research within the studio.
14. A clear international strategy should be developed and interwoven through the three-part mission of the Faculty: Education, Research and Social Responsibility. This strategy should construct the embedded nature

of internationalisation within the curriculum and therefore be visible from a student perspective within the Fine Arts programmes.

15. Staff development should also be linked with the Faculty's internationalisation strategy, as staff could benefit from more international experiences. In this context, recruitment of international staff would enrich teaching and research approaches across the Faculty. Defining how the Faculty's international strategy could support staff development around pedagogic practices and the impacts in/on the curriculum.
16. Quality assurance mechanisms in relation to internationalisation should be set up and this should be at the heart of any future developments in the Faculty, defining a strategic approach to internationalisation across its educational and research strands.
17. The Faculty should develop a constructively aligned framework within the Fine Arts programme including the development of learning outcomes, assessment criteria which should contribute to increasing clarity and transparency around the mode of assessment, for each level. This documentation would need to be clearly accessible to students and staff to enhance the levels of consistency and fairness in a transparent and supportive way.
18. The generation of clear learning outcomes for courses within programmes to assure the quality of the learning and assessment processes, by which the students understand what they will be assessed against (or for that matter how an academic will assess the studio-based work at the end of the year – thus currently making this process very subjective). These learning outcomes should also define the level learning for the student, whilst also enabling staff to develop a set of criteria by which assessment (at level appropriate stages) can be undertaken.
19. Set criterion should be established for assessment by the 'final jury' at the programme level, ensuring that the assessment criteria is aligned with the objectives and learning outcomes of each course and programme.
20. The Faculty should define the process through which participation of external staff, as the model of external examiners takes place, in order to enable more assured quality mechanisms and processes.
21. The Faculty should formalise a feedback process for students in the Fine Arts programmes, which aligns to the criteria for each course and programme level. The final assessment should use a set classification, for which definition of achievement is given at each level.
22. Based on previous recommendations, and as the Faculty formalises a feedback processes for students in the Fine Arts programmes, the final assessment (jury defence) should use a set classification, for which definition of achievement is given at each level. The Faculty should build upon the openness and accessibility of staff through strategic planning, evaluation and moderation in order to ensure greater levels of parity across all staff and students.
23. The Faculty should collect and assess data more systematically in order to contribute to defining the profile of students that apply for entry, as well as defining their equal opportunities policy. Analysis should be carried out also to identify the reasons for students to drop-out in the early stages of their programmes. More consistent data collection process in relation to alumni and their employment opportunities would be of benefit, as this could feed into the regular quality review of procedures as well as teaching and learning strategies within the Fine Arts programmes.
24. The development of internal processes for tracking graduates' employability patterns. This would contribute to the Faculty retaining connection with their alumni, which currently takes place in a more informal manner.
25. Staff development programmes should be put in place in relation with specialist pedagogical training, to ensure staff's understanding of the new educational policy requirements, strategies and benchmark statements, for learning and teaching.
26. In order to support the current three-year staff review, a formal annual appraisal process should be introduced, in order to understand and record staff needs, interests, and development opportunities, that include pedagogical activities.

27. Formal structures should be put in place in order to indicate to staff how much time should be invested in each activity across artistic practice, teaching and research. This could also include forward planning for sabbatical leave and practice/research-based leave.
28. Structures should be put in place to ensure teaching staff and students participation at all levels of the decision-making processes. Broadening the scope and inclusion of teaching staff within internal committee structures would benefit the lines of communication through the institution, whilst broadening the input into these committees within the Faculty as well. Greater levels of student inclusion in committees would also enhance awareness of the student experience.
29. The Faculty should explore alternative teaching models, while still maintaining studio-based methodologies. Current studio layouts encourage peer interaction (discussed in more detail in Section 5) and by recognising and utilising these interactions in a more structured way could help developing improved and more efficient teaching and learning practices.
30. A greater level of assessment of academic pedagogic quality assurance in relation to the activities involved in teaching should be integral to the development of new modes of teaching to enhance the students learning and experience.
31. The development of a recruitment policy for new staff should be aligned with a further strategy into the mission of the Faculty and to the development of teaching excellence and quality measures set against this. This should contribute to expanding the breadth of staff pedagogic expertise in line with forthcoming developments (e.g. House of Arts).
32. The Faculty should review its strategy for resourcing the provision of materials. This should include regular audits of workshop space, storage space, and equipment, to ensure ongoing appropriateness, to meet the needs of the professional and practice contexts (e.g. computer hardware and software).
33. Special attention should be given to first-year students to ensure that they can adequately engage with shared studio spaces.
34. Ongoing access to funds should be organised through more accessible, transparent, fluid mechanisms, aimed at the funding application and implementation processes, to ensure the provision of up-to-date equipment.
35. Greater engagement should be achieved in relation with VLEs, in particular *Moodle*, which is already available to Faculty members.
36. Budgets and expenditure should be linked to the quality and enhancement of teaching and learning activities, and to the review of programmes and courses. Decisions and actions should then be clearly communicated in a transparent manner.
37. The Faculty should continue to participate in lobbying at institutional and national level for the recognition of visual arts programmes and the potential increase in their available budgets, in line with scientific and technological development areas.
38. The provision of a formal initiative for the training and development of non-academic staff, which should be linked to the Faculty's strategic development plans.
39. The development of a communication strategy that clearly and transparently outlines procedures for staff and students, indicating remit and composition of committees. This should include clear guidelines for decision-making, for example in the allocation of internal grants.
40. The development of more proactive ways of gathering students' views, for example through regularly facilitated student fora and greater inclusion on existing committees to gather, reflect on and act upon student views with the focus based upon enhancement of student experience across all levels.
41. The Faculty should share information with the student cohort on how their feedback has generated changes in order to encourage student participation in feedback.
42. The development of diagonal working and focus groups, including a range of staff members from both academic and support teams as well as students, should be aimed to consider learning and teaching strategies and develop identified strengths to construct plans for action and share best practice.

43. The Faculty should review its approach to gathering students', staffs' and external representatives' views to ensure that they are informing decision-making adequately.
44. Teaching staff, support staff and students should be included at all levels of the decision-making process. Decisions should be transparent and made available to staff and students. An inclusive forum would contribute to the sense of collective thinking in relation to financial planning.
45. The national and University policies and regulatory framework should be viewed as a useful and positive opportunity to develop productive internal mechanisms to construct and achieve through internal evaluation, the mission and strategic plans embedded within it.
46. The Faculty's quality policy processes should be strengthened in alignment with the new rules and regulations stated in the *Amendment Act* and with the intention to include all aspects of the Faculty's teaching, research and public engagement activity in order to ensure that this system provides a useful tool for assessment and reflection.
47. The development of an inclusive, coherent and enhanced quality culture through proactively taking ownership of quality assurance and enhancement processes, in line with the University's and national standards. This will create a useful and constructive tool for self-evaluation (including staff, students, alumni, external stakeholder), that helps identify strengths, weaknesses and opportunities to enhance the faculty mission across the three core areas: Education, Research and Social Responsibility.
48. The Faculty should employ quality assurance and enhancement annual reporting as a way of evaluating and monitoring activities, such as: proposed benchmarks, the Faculty's alignment with mission and the quality of student experience.
49. As the Faculty incorporates quality assurance procedures, a wider representation of Faculty members is included in the development of the paperwork, particularly the self-evaluation document, including student consultation in the process. Both qualitative and quantitative data should be used for the quality review and evaluation process with considerations over the possible introduction of more qualitative data.
50. The development of a comprehensive Academic Quality Handbook that could help staff, students and external stakeholders to understand internal procedures and identify opportunities for participation in this reflection.
51. The establishment of a series of seminars/workshops (in coordination with the University) for of staff, student, alumni and stakeholders, aimed at generating a common understanding of the quality procedures, with particular emphasis on the local benefits for each programme (e.g. Fine Arts) and on identifying opportunities for the range of contributions from all the above groups to these processes.
52. The Faculty should produce guidelines and templates for Study Programme Review reports, as a way of evaluating and monitoring activities, in alignment with their mission and reflecting over the quality of the student experience. These should clearly explain the quality review cycle, including how the reflection undertaken through the review process will generate the implementation of necessary changes, and how the participants in this review (e.g. staff and students) will be informed of any changes generated by their comments and suggestions.
53. The Faculty should define qualitative and quantitative metrics, which should include expected targets at the institutional and study programme level. These should be mapped against quality reviews (five-yearly and annual) and should help the development of benchmarks and targets for the institution and for their study programmes, at undergraduate and postgraduate levels.
54. Although the Faculty showcases openness and accessibility to Deans, Vice-Deans, Heads of Departments and Heads of Studios, this should be built upon internal quality and enhancement structures to create further opportunities for collaboration and sharing of best practice.
55. Considering that MA and PhD students tend to lead on projects, linking teaching and practice, the review team recommends that this is more carefully structured in order to enable greater levels of parity, through strategic planning, evaluation and moderation, as well as quality processes that include all staff and students.

56. The Faculty should provide formal feedback to students and staff on changes made as a result of their feedback. This is likely to help raising response rates as the groups consulted will understand how their comments are considered by the Faculty.
57. The development of diagonal working groups aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of the *House of Art* project and other public facing initiatives, to ensure that new developments fully build on lessons learned while also sharing best practice evolving a toolkit that students and staff may go on to employ for other initiatives.
58. The development of working groups, where required, aimed to evaluate and monitor the Faculty's effectiveness in addressing the ongoing needs of the artistic professions and the currency of the curriculum. The findings could support annual programme monitoring and strategic planning.
59. The development of guidance outlining responsibilities and processes for the approval of public information, particularly the website and for the Virtual Learning Environment.

11. Conclusion

A qualified review team undertook the EQ-Arts quality enhancement review of the Faculty of Art and Design at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Usti nad Labem. The Review Team studied the documentation provided by the institution in advance to the Review Visit. However, it was evident through this process that further information was required. In particular, the Review Team requested more detail over benchmark statements for the Fine Arts programmes, intended learning outcomes for courses at the different levels within the BA and MA courses, as well as detailed feedback following assessment. This information was essential for quality assessment provided through this report and informed the recommendations proposed by the Review Team.

We appreciate the openness and honesty of managers and organisers of this review as well as of all participants at the meetings during the review visit. The organisation of the visit was exemplary and we would like to thank all of those involved in the process for their time and energy in ensuring a productive visit. There is evidence of significant work in preparation of the paperwork and timetable of the visit. The review team would suggest that benefit would be found in wider representation of students and external partners in future review assessments.

There are exemplary activities taking place across the Faculty, most notably the positioning of the Faculty as a driver for creative practice in order to enhance the creative environment of the city, with particular reference to social engagement and the shared responsibilities felt by members of the Faculty to achieve these aims. This developing ambition, including the proposed *House for Art* shows real proactivity in enhancing social responsibility and forms a method in which other areas of the Faculty could develop through similar forms of enhancement led focus. The *House of Art* will also provide a laboratory for testing new ideas such as the international studios, residencies and specialised workshops, contributing to the regional, national and international goals of the Faculty and attracting partnership and recognition.

It was clear for the Review Team that as the Faculty incorporates quality assurance procedures, it will be essential that a wider representation of Faculty members is involved in the development of the paperwork, particularly the self evaluation document, including student consultation in the process. Over the course of the review it became apparent that there are three core areas, Education, Research and Social Responsibility and there is a need for stronger alignment between these three core areas. The monitoring, critical reflection and evaluation of quality assurance is crucial within all of these aspects and building quality assurance into these strategic drivers. It will be key for the Faculty to incorporate annual reporting as a way of evaluating and monitoring activities, alignment with mission and the quality of student experience within a student-centred approach.

The Review Team appreciate the dedication, integrity and commitment of the academic and support staff and the engagement of postgraduate students within the Faculty.

Annex 1 – List of supporting documents

Annex 1. *Visit Schedule*

Annex 2. *Constitution of the Faculty of Art and Design*

Annex 3. *Strategic Plan FAD 2016-2020*

Annex 4. *Decision-Making Process*

Annex 5. *Directions of Creative, Artistic and Scientific Activities*

Annex 6 *Study and Examination rules for Studying BA and MA programmes in JEPU*

Annex 7 *The Higher Education Act*

Annex 8 *Rules for the selection procedure for academic staff of Jan Evangelista Purkyne University in Ústí nad Labem*

Annex 9 *UJEP Staff Working Regulations*

Annex 10 *Dean's Directive on Support of Creative Activities*

Annex 11 *Rectors Directive No.3*

Annex 12 *Plan for Implementation of the Strategic Plan*

Annex 13 *Organisational chart of the FAD at JEPU*

Annex 14 *Constitution of the FAD Article 17, 15, 14, 12 and Internal Governance Code of the FAD*

Annex 15 *Decision Making and Advisory Committees*

Annex 16 *Study and Examination Code of Study in Doctoral Programmes*

Annex 17 *Qualification Requirements for Thesis Supervision*