Zemaitija College

Arts and Crafts Pedagogy
(65302M111)

Final Assessment Report

Head of Expert Group	Dr. Kieran Meagher
Members:	Prof. Stefan Sonnvilla-Weiss
	Mr. Mart Janssens
	Ms. Ilze Vitola
	Mr. Diarmuid Mc Auliffe
	Mr. Antanas Snaras

Vilnius
2009

Title of studies program	Fine Art and Technologies Pedagogics
State code	65302M111
Type of studies	Non-University
Form of studies (duration in years)	Full-time studies (4), Extramural studies (4)
Program scope in credits	160
Degree and (or) Professional qualification	teacher
Program register date and order No.	May 29, 2003, No. 762

Key Parameters of Study Quality.

– aims and goals indicated in the study programme meets the expectations of students who live in a very dynamic world where professional qualities are valued more and more;

– content of the programme is in conformity with the aims and goals of the programme;

– content of the study programme is in conformity with the level of knowledge in the area (field) of science (arts)

– acquired knowledge, skills and abilities are in conformity with the requirements for professional activities

1.   Introduction

- Zemaitija College in Higher Education a non-university educational institution. The College is composed of three faculties; the Panel visited the Telšiai Faculty of Arts and Pedagogies, which has one fine art studies programme: Fine Art and Technologies Pedagogies. The visit took place on February 5, 2009.
- The programme places emphasis on regional traditions of cultural heritage and teaching

skills, and competences are based on these. The self-assessment process for the Fine Art and Technologies Pedagogies programme took place over the period February 2006 to July 2007. Zemaitija College lecturers, along with students and social partners, were included in the assessment working group. One major shortfall of the self-assessment report is that it has taken a limited view: those responsible for preparing it would appear to have had 'closed eyes' to weaknesses and problems regarding the content of the programme and with its realization.

2.   Aims and goals of the study programme

- It is explained in the SER that a main aim of the study programme to develop teachers who have a new attitude towards the world of socio-cultural meanings and values. However, the actual educational goals of the programme are mainly focused on knowledge and skills. This is too narrow a view in relation to conceiving a contemporary way of being for an art educator. Creativity and professional flexibility of the student (and also staff) and more contextualized view on fields of art, technology and education must be important part of the programme's educational goals and the day-to-day ethos.
- Some professional attributes are mentioned in the SER in relation to the overall aims and goals of the programme, but generally there is an absence of coherence and guiding rationale. In the opinion of the Panel the aims and goals indicated in the study programme do not fully meet the expectations of students who live in a dynamic world where professional qualities are valued more and more.

3.   The Programme

3.1. Structure, contents and study methods

- The scope of programme is 160 credits (8 semesters), it is full-time and its duration is four years. The programme does not include specializations. It consists of the following areas: general subjects of high education – 42 credits; programme subjects, designed to gain qualification - 76 credits; practice of professional activity - 24 credits; alternative subjects - 8 credits; development of course work - 2 credits and development of final work - 8 credits.
- In its consideration of content, the Panel found very few indications of connection and alignment between the different study subjects. The structure of the programme tends towards a mechanical sum of its subject parts, in contradistinction, for example, to a more appropriate conceptual, holistic curriculum model. There is little connection between the content of the theoretical subjects of pedagogies and the specialized area of visual arts education. There appears to be scant attention given to contemporary art theories and practice, contemporary art education methodologies, or to other fields that potentially could be the basis for developing students' creativity. Overall, the theoretical areas addressed by the programme and the studio work itself seem not to include ideas and practices which could be helpful and necessary for students to conceive and implement art classes that are relevant to today's educational needs and art-related activities in future.
- The Panel's visit to the various facilities gave rise to an impression that the dominating

method is one of prescription, following tutor's instructions. But the student teacher of art and technologies of this century needs to experience an active approach to learning to become successful in challenging unhelpful orthodoxies in education.

3.2 Execution of studies and support for students

- As noted above, the content of the study subjects is far from the needs of contemporary art or technologies education. The studio work in drawing, painting and composition does not reflect developments in art and art teaching since the Second World War, whilst the level of the technology skill-based activities is very low. An outmoded approach to drawing from nature, where construction lines are used in a formulaic manner, was found by the experts in many student drawings. (See, for example, figure 1).

 Figure 1

- The dominant features of the student work in art or technologies are obsolete when placed against new trends in art, design and visual culture, where different issue-based topics (far removed from conventional still live arrangements) and new technologies have revolutionized how images are created and communicated, how they are interpreted and how teachers need to be educated. Regrettably, the Panel did not find evidence of creativity, a sense of the student's own vision, or evidence of a strong relationship between the work of the programme and the regional environment. Furthermore, there is not sufficient attention given to the importance of process in the creation of work. Instead, the Panel found a preoccupation with themes in drawing and painting, given as titles of (finished) pieces. (See, for example, Annex 1). There also is a significant gap between the visual arts element art and the technology subjects. It is questionable as to whether food technology, or the type of embroidery the Panel saw being made, should be placed with fine art as part of a study programme.

- During its meeting with students the Panel heard calls for the College to invite teachers with new ideas. It was felt that the presence of new people could improve the quality of art and technology work at the College. Students referred also to their practical training and the wide variety of technological areas available to them as being main positive aspects of their experience – students saw their creative work as being practical as well as personal. It was noted that 'open days', intended for school-leavers seeking to become familiar with fine art and technologies studies and teaching, take place, and that programme information is provided in advertising material and the College website. There is also support for working students, who can avail of a freer study schedule. Students have also the possibility to study according to an individual programme, which may be developed for one semester or the entire period of one's studies.

3.3. Variation in the number of students

- Annually about 20 students are admitted into the first year of the programme (though in 2004/2005 the number of students was larger). The first student cohort (12 female students) graduated in 2007. Numbers have decreased a little for the past three years, with a competition ratio of 1.5 applicants (2004/2005) and 0.8 (2006/2007).

3.4. Teaching staff

- All lecturers involved in the programme shall have master's degree or equivalent education, according to the SER. Lecturers make up 44% of the total personnel, 40% are assistants and 16% are associate professors. Implementation of the programme is supported by associate professors from Šiauliai University and Vilnius Academy of Fine Art - Telsiai Faculty of Fine Art. In general, the teaching staff presented itself as a well-motivated, college and community-focused team. The staff appeared confident about place of the cultural values of the region; however, it is vital that the study of local traditions and crafts is seen within the context of the needs of contemporary life, rather being narrow in focus. Staff exchange and international contacts could help to develop outward thinking and the expertise of the teaching staff.

3.5. Advantages and disadvantages of the program

- The linkage of the two fields, fine art and technologies, could be a strength, but only where both are considered within the contexts of contemporary visual culture and influences of new media on visual and design practices. There are many fruitful ways of blurring the boundaries of the two fields, by creative thinking in relation to the formulation of an integrated curriculum and the use of active, collaborative methods of learning; such an integrated programme would highly beneficial for students, however, the Panel found no evidence of an ambition to change the overall culture or structure of the programme to engender a more holistic form of art and technologies education.
- Mention is made in Appendix 9 of areas that can be developed; though attention is not given to the how these areas can be changed in terms of content and methodologies. Maintaining foreign contacts, using information technologies or studying English, of themselves will not give rise to the kind of relevant study programme needed to meet the expectations of students who live in a very dynamic world where professional qualities are valued more and more. This is because there is insufficient attention given to the main problem; that content, methodologies and overall quality of what is being offered to students.

4. Material conditions

- The fine art and technologies pedagogies programme is situated in several buildings; some workrooms and the library are shared to some extent with Art Academy. The learning spaces in College could be designed in more open way so as toinvite and encourage students to try new and more ambitious creative work.

- The layout of the library suggests quite a formal division between College and Academy reading materials.

5.   External relations

- There was some cooperation with other Lithuanian colleges in the preparation of study programmes in fine art and technologies education. The College has signed cooperation agreements with various culture and education institutions: Šiauliai University, Panevėžys College, Telšiai secondary schools and gymnasiums, Telšiai exhibition hall, Telšiai culture centre, Telšiai education centre and Žemaičai Museum "ALKA".
- There is no international partnership agreements mentioned in the SER.
- The College is commencing some Erasmus exchange activities and there is some contact with one art college in Portugal.

6.   Feedback

- According to the SER 60% of graduates work in education institutions, while 30% continue their studies in Šiauliai University. It is noted in the SER that feedback is ensured by annual conferences where the graduates present reports on their work.

7.   Internal quality assurance

- Internal study quality assurance system in Zemaitija College was started in 2003. The procedures involved are described in SER, but there is an absence of what would be important data about assessment criteria and also about results of the assessment.

8.   Recommendations

8.1. Compulsory Recommendations

- Reconvene the programme Self Assessment Group, or an equivalent representative body, whose remit will be to draw up proposals to address immediately the problems identified by the Expert Panel taking into account the Panel's compulsory recommendations.

- Re-orientate the programme so that its main goal is one of providing for the education of the present cohort of students, especially with regard to enhancing provision for those students in these areas: work in fine art, work in technologies, contemporary art, design and technology education, active learning mythologies, communication technologies and teaching practice. Consideration most be given to appropriate remedial activities in these areas in order to ensure that students meet the demands of teaching and other teaching – related cultural work.

- In the area of fine art, instigate a series of studio workshops: the workshops should be conceived as environments for enquiry into contemporary visual practices and be broadly experimental in nature. The workshops should address drawing, painting and composition, but also photography, sculpture and new media. Students should be assisted to incorporate their fine art work, along with related curriculum materials for teaching, into a professional portfolio.

- In the area of technologies, instigate a series of studio workshops: the workshops should be conceived as environments for enquiry into visual design concerns and be technology-based and problem-orientated in nature. The workshops should address traditional craft areas, but from twenty-first century perspectives and they should integrate the creative use of new media. Students should be assisted to incorporate their technology work, along with related curriculum materials for teaching, into a professional portfolio.

- The learning resource should be extended to include some new materials in book, journal and electronic form in the areas of contemporary art, craft, design and technology education.

- Teaching should be re-orientated away from didactic and content centred methods and towards students' experience of learning. In this regard emphasis should be placed on problem-solving (in fine art and technology workshops and in relation to conceiving scheme plans for teaching), and to active forms of learning which integrate seminars with individual/peer-to-peer activities.

- Online communications technologies should used to help broaden the mix of course delivery. Students should be assisted to incorporate materials from their online learning into a professional portfolio.

- Attention should be given to ways to improve the organisation and operation of practice in schools and other settings. In particular, consideration should be given to ways of assisting students to develop educational ideas and methods from the fine art and technology workshop activities and the programme seminars and to ways of ensuring that those ideas and methods are tried out and reflected upon in practice. There is an urgent need to increase the amount of contact teaching practice hours and the number of teaching practice supervision visits by tutors.

- A Student Programme Handbook be prepared as a matter of urgency and issued to all students.

- It is especially important given the context of restricted accreditation that formal procedures be put in place to facilitate regular meetings between staff and students regarding students' welfare and the implementation of the recommendations of the Expert Panel.

8.2 Proposal on Accreditation

Study programme of Zemaitija College:

non-university study programme *Arts and Crafts Pedagogy* (state code 65302M111) is given Restricted Accreditation.

Head of the group:	Dr. Kieran Meagher
Members:	Prof. Stefan Sonvilla-Weiss
	Mr. Diarmuid Mc Auliffe
	Mr. Martin Janssens
	Mrs. Ilze Vitola
	Dr. Antanas Šnaras

STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

STUDIJŲ VERTINIMO EKSPERTŲ TARYBOS POSĖDŽIO PROTOKOLAS

2009-06-29 Nr. 6-55

Vilnius

Posėdis įvyko 2009 m. birželio 26 d.

Posėdžio pirmininkas Jonas Ruškus

Posėdžio sekretorė Grytė Staskevičiūtė

Dalyvavo Tarybos nariai: Juozas Atkočiūnas, Vytautas Daujotis, Kęstutis Dubnikas, Jonas Gudmonas, Rimantas Jankauskas, Onutė Junevičienė, Vytautas Juščius, Juozas Kulys, Daina Lukošiūnienė, Vida Staniulienė, Marijonas Rimantas Urbonavičius.

Posėdyje taip pat dalyvavo: direktorius E. Stumbrys (svarstant 1-9 klausimus), Studijų vertinimo skyriaus vedėjas A. Šerpatauskas, laikinai einanti skyriaus vedėjo pavaduotojos pareigas R.Šlikaitė (svarstant 2 ir 10-11 klausimus) , vyr. specialistė D. Buivydienė (svarstant 3-5 ir 9 klausimus), ekspertai A. Šnaras (svarstant 9 klausimą), V. Salienė (svarstant 11 klausimą), D. Pociūtė-Abukevičienė (svarstant 11 klausimą), Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto atstovė I. Dabašinskienė (svarstant 3 klausimą), Vilniaus pedagoginio universiteto atstovai V. Matonis, G. Riškutė, R. Mikučionytė, S. Ustilaitė, V. Gudžinskienė, R. Proškuvienė, A. Vilkas (svarstant Vilniaus pedagoginio universiteto edukologijos ir dailės krypčių studijų programas), Šiaulių universiteto atstovai V. Žalys, I. Burneikienė (svarstant Šiaulių universiteto dailės krypties studijų programas), Švietimo ir mokslo ministerijos atstovas S. Grybkauskas (svarstant 3 klausimą), Žemaitijos kolegijos atstovės S. Savickienė, J. Venclovienė (svarstant Žemaitijos kolegijos dailės krypties studijų programą), Marijampolės kolegijos atstovai K. Traškevičius, N. Vosylienė (svarstant Marijampolės kolegijos dailės krypties studijų programą), Vilniaus universiteto atstovė N. Bražėnienė (svarstant Vilniaus universiteto edukologijos krypties studijų programą).

DARBOTVARKĖ: <...>

9. Išorinio išsamiojo dailės krypties studijų programų vertinimo išvadų svarstymas.

<...>

9. SVARSTYTA. Išorinio išsamiojo dailės krypties studijų programų vertinimo išvados.

<...>

NUTARTA:

<...>

1. Pritarti ekspertų grupės parengtoms vertinimo išvadoms ir siūlymui akredituoti ribojamai:

<...>

– Žemaitijos kolegijos koleginių studijų programą *Dailės ir technologijų pedagogika* (65302M111);

<...>

Posėdžio pirmininkas   Jonas Ruškus

Posėdžio sekretorė   Grytė Staskevičiūtė