



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Klaipėdos universiteto  
***DAILĖS PROGRAMOS (612W12001)***  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

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

Grupės vadovas:  
Team leader:

Prof. dr. h.c. John Butler

Grupės nariai:  
Team members:

Rugilė Ališauskaitė

Virginija Januškevičiūtė

Prof. dr. Atis Kampars

Prof. dr. Vojtěch Lahoda

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language - English

Vilnius  
2013

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Dailė</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612W12001
Studijų sritis	menai
Studijų kryptis	dailė
Studijų programos rūšis	universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	nuolatinė (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	dailės bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2004-06-07, ĮSAK - 852

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

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

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

## CONTENTS

CONTENTS .....	3
I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....	5
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2. Curriculum design .....	5
3. Staff .....	6
4. Facilities and learning resources .....	7
5. Study process and student assessment.....	8
6. Programme management .....	10
III. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	13
IV. SUMMARY .....	15
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....	18

## I. INTRODUCTION

In carrying out the review of the BA Fine Art course the Expert Team (the Team chaired by Professor John Butler, Head of Birmingham School of Art, Birmingham City University, UK; with Rugilė Ališauskaitė, an undergraduate student of Vytautas Magnus University, working towards a BA in Baltic Region Culture and Art, Lithuania; Virginija Januškevičiūtė a curator at the Contemporary Art Centre, Vilnius, Lithuania; Prof. dr. Atis Kampars, the Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga, Latvia; and Prof. dr. Vojtěch Lahoda from the Institute of Art History of Charles University in Prague and also the Director of the Institute of Art History of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic) were guided by the principles of objectivity, impartiality, respect for the participants of the evaluation process, confidentiality and cooperation.

The Team followed the criteria defined by the *Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes* and other Lithuanian legal acts governing quality evaluation in higher education.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS**

### ***1. Programme aims and learning outcomes***

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

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

Key stake-holders including students, alumni and social partners have all stated they would like more professional skills (including: entrepreneurship; presentation and management) developed to support the graduates when they leave the University and enter the labour market.

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

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

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

### ***2. Curriculum design***

The programme complies with national legal acts and regulations for undergraduate study programmes in Lithuania.

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

notes the slow introduction of independent learning, which the Team thinks is too late to prepare the students for the professional world.

The SER states the study programme results in students being able to “*Apply modern technologies and their methods in art and interdisciplinary projects. During one’s studies learn how to independently and professionally formulate one’s creative goals, choose proper means to implement them and be able to create works of fine arts (paintings) that would allow one to fully compete in the art market*”, which only appears to be facilitated in their final year in the major project. The current curriculum and learning outcomes place great emphasis on the development of the practical skills required of a ‘painter’, which the Team sees as a narrow definition of a contemporary ‘painter’ artist and does not facilitate what the programme claims the students are able to do. The programme is very successful in developing student’s practical painting and observational skills, but the shift from teacher-led to more student-centred learning is slow in being introduced. Whilst the Team supports the development of the craft skills it believes students should take more responsibility for their learning earlier in the course and elements for independent learning, risk taking should happen earlier and with increasing credit value.

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

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

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

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

### **3. Staff**

In accordance with the Law on Higher Education and Research of the Republic of Lithuania (No. XI-242), the Order of the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania Approving the General Requirements of the First Degree and Integrated Study Programmes (No. V-501), the staffing legal requirements for the study programme are met.

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

The permanent teachers have an average of 16 years teaching experience, but the Team believes it is critical that to achieve the required standards the right specialist teachers should be teaching

the appropriate programme elements and notes the programme should reconsider who is delivering and supervising the final dissertation to ensure the students gain the required specialist guidance and appropriate research methodologies.

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

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

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

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

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

In addition to the University's new resources to support staff research and professional development, the Team found that it also supports staff development through: guiding teachers to prepare the modules of their taught subjects and accumulating methodological materials; participating in conferences and creative workshops; and facilitating staff participation in international exchange and similar study programmes with foreign schools – although the Team note there is little engagement in the international exchange programme.

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

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

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

#### ***4. Facilities and learning resources***

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

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

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

The Team found that there has been good development in the Faculty's IT learning and teaching resources, but the use of them should be better embedded into the programme. In meetings with the studio staff, alumni and the students the Team found there was little engagement in the use of IT and digital media both in practice and as teaching and learning tools. The alumni commented that they often relied on teachers to bring in their own computers and wished that there was more use of IT in the programme.

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

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

### ***5. Study process and student assessment***

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

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

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

The Team does think that if the Faculty did clarify the title and aims of the programme it would also help with its recruitment, giving the prospective students a clear understanding of what the programme's mission and aims are.

The current students and alumni stated that the University needs to do more to market the BA course as under-recruitment will threaten course closure – “nobody knows about it”.



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

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

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

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

As with the Learning Outcomes the Team found a very clear mapping of the learning process consistent with the level of studies and the level of qualification offered. These processes appear to be determined by the University and present good guidelines to the programme teams. Inconsistency the Team finds is between the content and objectives of the programmes modules and the aims of the programme. This inconsistency is around the priorities of the study programme's study content and study methods as stated in the SER:

- (c) the relevance of the programme (must meet the needs of today's society);
- (d) the programme consistency and systemacity (it should be based on the principles of fundamental theoretical, methodological, and practical layout's consistency, and logical and systematic relationship between subjects' content)

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

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

As stated in the SER academic support for student achievement and monitoring is performed through:

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

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

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

In the University students are also provided with psychological, sports, health, and cultural support. The University and the Faculty of Arts implement: broad cultural activities including traditional festivals and events, student concerts and art projects; concessions are granted to students who visit Klaipeda Concert Hall, Klaipeda Musical theater events; the Exhibition Hall provides a free opportunity to attend exhibitions of works of art; an art shop provides a 5% discount for Department of Fine Arts students to buy necessary artists materials. Scholarships for full-time students are awarded according to the study regulations. Students can receive two types of scholarships: encouraging and social. Klaipeda University has 3 dormitories.

The Team is positive about the support and resources made available to the students.

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

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

The Team believes the system appears to be working well, but there is a clear contradiction in these two statements and further statements in the SER (4.1 p.42), which states *express a lack of clarity between the learning outcomes, assessment criteria and the grading 10 point criteria and feeding back to the student*, therefore the Team recommends this needs to urgent clarification.

The Team notes the programme’s difficulties in ‘tracking’ graduate students and in only meeting five alumni it make it difficult for us to make a definitive comment on how course meets the providers’ expectations, but it is important that the programme team do give this due consideration through increasing dialogue with them and using their expertise. As stated earlier the alumni we met were positive about keeping in contact and providing feedback and advice, but this was currently at an informal ‘friendship’ level.

## **6. Programme management**

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

The Team noted in the SER (p.49) the programme states '*Students are partially involved in evaluating and improving the quality of studies*'..... '*However, there is a lack of students' initiative to ensure study quality*' and thinks the programme must strive to get greater student participation in the evaluation process, as the students and alumni both reported to the Team that they were not asked to comment on the quality or content of their programme of studies.

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

The SER states:

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

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

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

The Team fully supports this process, but found many aspects not rigorously carried out and little quantitative data to inform the evaluation, and recommends the programme carries out a more systematic self-evaluation through closer consideration of its strengths (including distinctive features), weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The Team found a lot of repetition in the SER without stating what were the programme's clear strengths (of which the Team has found many) the weaknesses, threats or opportunities. The Team recommends the University and Faculty to establish clear, appropriate metrics by which programmes can measure their achievement.

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

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

There are still areas raised in the 2011 review that need further development such as the international dimension both in terms of student and staff mobility, which requires additional

support by the University and in the curriculum with more focus on contemporary art discourse and philosophy. Although there has been some improvement in collaboration with external Stakeholders there is still room for considerable improvement.

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

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

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

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

Study Regulations [http://www.ku.lt/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/20101008\\_11\\_22.pdf](http://www.ku.lt/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/20101008_11_22.pdf); Klaipėda University Statute (2010);

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

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

From the beginning of the 2009-10 academic year new quality assurance methods have been introduced by the University as stated in the SER *“The aim is to implement a curriculum assessment methodology, the principles of which are similar to the ‘Tuning’ project, supported by the European Commission and the General Directorate of Culture and Education. The main quality control aims are: study quality management, study criteria matching the ECTS system, curriculum relevance, organization of studies control involving social partners, weighed general and subject-specific competences balance in study programmes”*. The Team commends these developments, but as stated previously some elements such as curriculum relevance, organisation of studies and engagement with current students, alumni, and stakeholders should be more formerly reviewed and utilised by the programme management in the Quality Assurance process.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Team recommends:

1. Klaipeda University and the Faculty to continue to lobby the Ministry for change in the National Admissions System, to create equal opportunities within, and support inclusive cultural strategies throughout the country. This system makes it very difficult for the Faculty to be competitive at a national and international level. The Team is happy for the University to reference our support for the change.
2. the programme management and teaching staff reconsider the clarity of the programme title in relationship to its stated aims to make it clear to prospective students and the professional field what the mission is; both in relation to a programme placing emphasis on Painting as its major discipline within an interdisciplinary fine arts study programme and the possible polarity between 'regional tradition' and its claim for contemporary interdisciplinary practice.
3. the Faculty should reconsider the emphasis the management place on the pedagogic element of the programme as the students and alumni are unanimous in stating this is the least popular and beneficial to their career development.
4. more professional skills (including: entrepreneurship; presentation and management) developed to support the graduates when they leave the University and enter the labour market.
5. it would be better to use clearer, more descriptive titles to the modules instead of Painting I-VII, Sculpture I-II, Drawing I-VII, Composition I-VII and Art History I-IV etc. to help the students better understand the progression in learning rather than emphasis on process.
6. the programme to address the course content to ensure it meets its learning objectives and prepares students for the professional world including:
  - the use of digital technology for learning (e.learning tools – Moodle etc.);
  - professional development skills (ie. Business, entrepreneurial and management skills);
  - contemporary discourse in art and philosophy;
  - digital software training;
  - critical writing and research skills.
7. students should take more responsibility for their learning earlier in the course with elements for independent learning and risk-taking. The teaching team should continue to encourage and recognise the student's engagement in external projects, competitions and exhibitions, but accredit this engagement towards their final award.
8. the right specialist teachers should be teaching the appropriate programme elements and the programme should reconsider who is delivering and supervising the final dissertation to ensure the students gain the specialist guidance and appropriate research methodologies.
9. a more varied teaching input is necessary through visiting tutors (national and international).
10. the Faculty to find ways to compensate for the low turnover of teaching staff and hopefully the new faculty structure will enable greater crossover of teaching. It also needs to introduce succession planning.
11. the Faculty provide staff development to develop the teaching staff's learning and teaching strategies and methods to help them engage in new methodologies involving digital technology tools and e-learning.
12. the students have more studio space for their practice.
13. the use of IT learning and teaching resources should be better embedded into the programme. Both studio staff and students need to make better use of them as teaching and learning tools.
14. the programme to ensure the students are clear about the links between the content and objectives of the programme's modules and the aims of the programme.

15. the Faculty and programme need to provide adequate resources for the 'tracking' of graduate students for 'expert' advice and recording 'employability'.
16. the programme must strive to get greater student participation in the evaluation process.
17. the programme carries out a more systematic self-evaluation through closer consideration of its strengths (including distinctive features), weaknesses, opportunities and threats.
18. further development such as the international dimension both in terms of student and staff mobility, which requires additional support by the University and in the curriculum with more focus on contemporary art discourse and philosophy.
19. the programme develops more links with stakeholders on a national and international level as it should be more concerned how they perform in comparison in these arenas. There is still room for considerable improvement of collaboration with external Stakeholders.
20. the University and Faculty to establish clear, appropriate metrics by which programmes can measure their achievement – success and areas for development.
21. Quality Assurance and Management processes and measures introduced by the University need to be better embedded in the programme.

## IV. SUMMARY

### *1. Programme aims and learning outcomes*

The programme's stated aim is clear and concise and this aim is largely possible if the student achieves the well-articulated learning outcomes. The Team believe that the programme aim and learning outcomes are consistent with the level of studies and the level of qualification offered. The Team think the very recent development of merging the Department of Fine Arts into the new Department of Architecture, Design & Fine Arts is a positive move, which could facilitate greater interdisciplinary practice with cognate disciplines, more collaborative projects, electives and new teaching and learning strategies.

There is however inconsistency between the aim and the general description of the programme which places a very strong emphasis on 'regional tradition' and 'painting' within an interdisciplinary fine arts study programme; with a danger that the programme becomes too provincial, disadvantaging the students' professional career as an artist able to "*adequately assess the art processes happening in today's world*". Key stake-holders including students, alumni and social partners have all stated they would like more professional skills developed to support the graduates when they leave the University and enter the labour market.

### *2. Curriculum design*

The programme complies with national legal acts and regulations for undergraduate study programmes in Lithuania. The study subjects and modules are equitably spread across the years giving the students a balanced workload. The programme is very successful in developing student's practical painting and observational skills and the Team supports the development of the craft skills. The students have the opportunity to study electives such as philosophy, psychology, foreign language etc.

There is an over emphasis on teacher-led practice and the Team notes the slow introduction of independent learning and 'risk taking', which the Team thinks is too late to prepare the students for the professional world. The current curriculum and learning outcomes place great emphasis on the development of the practical skills required of a 'painter', which the Team sees as a narrow definition of a contemporary 'painter' artist, and does not facilitate what the programme claims the students are able to do.

### *3. Staff*

The staffing legal requirements for the study programme are met. The University's staff recruitment strategy is very thorough and does ensure the new staff have the appropriate qualifications and qualities required. The teachers have the appropriate qualifications to deliver the programme. The programme team is small but they are very much appreciated by the students and alumni who all felt they are very dedicated to and highly motivated by the programme. The ratio of students to staff is manageable and equivalent to many European Higher Arts Education institutions. The University's new resources to support staff research and professional development are very welcome. All the teaching staff are practicing artists exhibiting nationally and internationally to an appropriate level.

The right specialist teachers should be teaching the appropriate programme elements to achieve the required standards. A more varied teaching input is necessary through visiting tutors (national and international) to offer a broader range of voice and knowledge. There is little staff engagement in the international exchange programme. There has been a noticeable increase in

staff workload due to a decrease in funding for salaries and an increase in teaching to 930 hours, reducing the time for staff's scientific and artistic activities. The teaching staff turnover is very low in the programme, but this is due to circumstances beyond the programme's control. The teaching staff's learning and teaching strategies and methods provide little engagement with new methodologies involving digital technology tools and e-learning.

#### ***4. Facilities and learning resources***

There has been noticeable improvement in buildings and the learning and teaching resources since the last review and there has been good development in the Faculty's IT learning and teaching resources. There is adequate provision for the programme to achieve its learning outcomes and it supports this with good connections with external agencies. The library resources are good and fit for purpose.

The quality of the students' work would benefit if they could have more studio space for their practice. The final year studios are located at Klaipeda Culture Communication Centre (KCCC) 2 km from the Arts Faculty, limiting peer learning for junior years. There was little engagement in the use of IT and digital media both in practice and as teaching and learning tools. The programme needs to provide better orientation and skills development to utilise the library and computer resources.

#### ***5. Study process and student assessment***

All students stated they 'loved' the programme and the teachers. The University has developed a teaching, learning and evaluation system to ensure that the students would acquire necessary subject knowledge, subject skills and abilities, as well as transferable skills. The system of learning outcomes, the learning development process and the assessment criteria directly related to the Learning Outcomes are working well. There is a very clear mapping of the learning process consistent with the level of studies and the level of qualification offered. These processes appear to be determined by the University and present good guidelines to the programme teams. There are thorough student academic support services and comprehensive social and welfare services.

The National Admissions System is having a negative impact on recruitment of the best and most appropriate students for this programme, and this is not only financial but also for the study process as the level of peer learning is also critically diminished and offers little to show possible levels of achievement. The University and Faculty need to do more to market the BA programme, as under-recruitment will threaten course closure. The students lacked critical rigor in their discussion and presented no clear motivation or ambition in their statements and made no reference to contemporary discourse or theory. Students are encouraged to engage in external projects, competitions and exhibitions and they do so, but this is problematic when they are given little opportunity for independent studies and these activities are not accredited by the programme. Students do participate in ERASMUS and international programmes but in very small numbers. The engagement with alumni is largely informal. All alumni agreed that they have not received enough opportunity to give feedback on the quality of their learning experience during studies, nor have been approached to help in developing the programme since graduating.

#### ***6. Programme management***

There is a student member in the Programme Committee, providing their perspective and wishes. Student entry, progression, withdrawal, completion data has been collected since 2006-7. There are records of teacher and student mobility statistical data. Discussion on programme aims, study



process and organisation, themes and supervisors, assessment questions and examination results is organized annually. A worthy commitment to the programme is evident by: improvement of the resources since the last review in 2011; resources to support staff development; better Quality Assurance and Management processes introduced by the University; better engagement with external stakeholders. There are strong connections with some local arts organisations.

There should be greater student participation in the evaluation process, to comment on the quality or content of their programme of studies. Many aspects of programme evaluation are not rigorously carried out and there is little quantitative data to inform the evaluation. There should be greater collaboration with external stakeholders as most stakeholders are 'local' without knowledge or experience of national/international competitors. Quality Assurance and Management processes and measures should be better embedded in the programme. Some elements such as curriculum relevance, organisation of studies and engagement with current students, alumni, and stakeholders should be more formally reviewed and utilised by the programme management.

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

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

*Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

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

Grupės vadovas:  
Team leader:

Prof. dr. h.c. John Butler

Grupės nariai:  
Team members:

Rugilė Ališauskaitė

Virginija Januškevičiūtė

Prof. dr. Atis Kampars

Prof. dr. Vojtěch Lahoda

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS  
DAILĖ (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612W12001) 2013-12-19 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO  
IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-566 IŠRAŠAS**

&lt;...&gt;

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Dailė* (valstybinis kodas – 612W12001) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	<b>Iš viso:</b>	<b>13</b>

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

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

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

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

&lt;...&gt;

**IV. APIBENDRINIMAS*****1. Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai***

Programos tikslas suformuluotas aiškiai ir glaustai ir šis tikslas yra įmanomas, jei studentai pasiekia aiškiai išdėstytus studijų tikslus. Ekspertų grupės nuomone, programos tikslas ir studijų rezultatai atitinka studijų pakopą ir suteikiamos kvalifikacijos lygį. Ekspertų grupė mano, kad neseniai įvykęs Dailės katedros įjungimas į naują Architektūros, dizaino ir dailės katedrą yra teigiamas žingsnis, kuris galėtų paskatinti interdiscipliniškumą per artimas disciplinas, pasiūlyti daugiau bendradarbiavimo projektų, pasirenkamųjų dalykų ir naujas mokymo ir mokymosi strategijas.

Tačiau tikslas neatitinka bendro programos aprašymo, kuriame akcentuojama „regiono tradicija“ ir „tapyba“ tarpdisciplininėje dailės studijų programoje. Egzistuoja grėsmė, kad programa tampa per daug provincialia ir ribojančia studentų kaip menininkų, gebančių „*tinkamai vertinti meno procesus, vykstančius šiandiniame pasaulyje*“, profesinę karjerą. Visi pagrindiniai socialiniai dalininkai, įskaitant studentus, absolventus ir socialinius partnerius, teigė norintys, kad būtų ugdoma daugiau profesinių gebėjimų, kurie naudingi absolventams, kai jie baigia universitetą ir įsijungia į darbo rinką.

## **2. Programos sandara**

Programa atitinka nacionalinius teisės aktus ir reikalavimus pirmosios pakopos studijų programoms Lietuvoje. Studijų dalykai ir moduliai yra tolygiai paskirstyti per metus ir sudaro studentams subalansuotą darbo krūvį. Programoje labai sėkmingai ugdomi studentų praktiniai tapybos ir stebėjimo gebėjimai ir ekspertų grupė pritaria praktinių profesinių gebėjimų ugdymui. Studentai taip pat turi galimybę studijuoti pasirenkamuosius kursus, tokius kaip filosofija, psichologija, užsienio kalba ir t.t.

Ekspertų grupė pažymi, kad programoje per daug akcentuojamas dėstytojo vadovavimas, o savarankiškas mokymasis ir „rizikavimas“ pradedami skatinti per lėtai ir per vėlai, kad studentai spėtų pasiruošti profesiniam pasauliui. Dabartinė studijų programa ir studijų rezultatai labai akcentuoja „tapytojų“ reikalingų praktinių gebėjimų ugdymą, kas, ekspertų grupės nuomone, susiaurina šiuolaikinio menininko-tapytojo apibrėžimą ir neskatina gebėjimų, kuriuos programa teigia studentus turint.

## **3. Personalas**

Studijų programos personalo sudėtis atitinka teisinius reikalavimus. Universiteto taikoma personalo atrankos strategija yra labai išsami ir užtikrina, kad įdarbinamas personalas turėtų tinkamas kvalifikacijas ir reikalingas savybes. Dėstytojų kvalifikacija yra tinkama programos vykdymui. Programą vykdančių grupė yra nedidelė, tačiau labai vertinama studentų ir absolventų, kurie vieningai teigė, kad dėstytojai yra labai motyvuoti ir pasišventę programai. Vienam dėstytojui tenkantis studentų skaičius yra panašus į dėstytojų ir studentų santykį daugelyje Europos aukštųjų menų mokyklų. Universiteto naujai skiriami išteklių akademinio personalo atliekamiems tyrimams ir kvalifikacijos kėlimui yra labai sveikintini. Visi dėstytojai yra kuriantys menininkai, tinkamai dalyvaujantys nacionalinėse ir tarptautinėse parodose.

Norint pasiekti reikalaujamus standartus, atitinkamus programos dalykus turi dėstyti tinkamos specializacijos dėstytojai. Reikalinga didesnė dėstytojų įvairovė, įtraukiant vizituojančius lektorius (Lietuvos ir užsienio), kurie pasiūlytų platesnį požiūrį ir žinių spektrą. Personalas mažai dalyvauja tarptautinėse mainų programose. Dėl sumažėjusio darbo užmokesčio fondo pastebimai padidėjo personalo darbo krūvis, o dėstytojų krūvis padidėjo iki 930 valandų, todėl sumažėjo laikas, skiriamas mokslinei ir meninei veiklai. Akademinio personalo kaita studijų programoje yra labai maža, tačiau tai sąlygoja aplinkybės, kurioms pati programa įtakos neturi. Akademinio personalo taikomos mokymo(si) strategijos ir metodai mažai susiję su naujomis metodikomis, taikančiomis skaitmenines technologijas ir e-mokymąsi.

## **4. Materialieji išteklių**

Po paskutinio vertinimo pastebimai pagerėjo pastatai ir mokymo bei mokymosi išteklių, o taip pat Fakulteto informacinių technologijų mokymo ir mokymosi išteklių. Programos materialinė bazė leidžia pasiekti numatytus studijų rezultatus, prie to taip pat prisideda ir geri ryšiai su partneriais už universiteto ribų. Bibliotekos išteklių yra geri ir atitinka programos tikslą.

Studentų darbo kokybę pagerėtų, jei jie turėtų daugiau studijų erdvės praktikai. Baigiamųjų metų studentų studijos yra Klaipėdos kultūrų komunikacijų centre už 2 km nuo Menų fakulteto, o tai riboja jaunesnių kursų studentų mokymąsi iš vyresnių kolegų. Mažai naudojamos informacinės technologijos ir skaitmeninės medijos praktikoje ir kaip mokymo(si) priemonės. Programa turi tikslingiau orientuoti sstudentus ir ugdyti jų gebėjimus, leidžiančius panaudoti bibliotekos ir kompiuterinius išteklius.

### **5. Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas**

Visi studentai teigė, kad jiems patinka programa ir dėstytojai. Universitetas sukūrė mokymo, mokymosi ir vertinimo sistemą, turinčią užtikrinti, kad studentai įgytų būtinas dalykines žinias, profesinius įgūdžius ir gebėjimus bei perkeliamuosius gebėjimus. Studijų rezultatų, studijų proceso ir vertinimo kriterijų sistema, tiesiogiai susijusi su programos studijų rezultatais, veikia gerai. Mokymosi proceso išdėstymas labai aiškiai atitinka studijų pakopą ir suteikiamos kvalifikacijos lygį. Šiuos procesus apibrėžia Universitetas ir duoda geras gaires programų komitetams. Studentams teikiama nuosekli akademinė parama ir visapusiškos socialinės bei kitokios paramos paslaugos.

Nacionalinė priėmimo į aukštąsias mokyklas sistema neigiamai veikia geriausių ir tinkamiausių studentų pritraukimą į šią programą ir tas poveikis nėra vien finansinis. Poveikis studijų procesui pasireiškia kritiškai sumažėjusiu mokymosi iš kolegų-studentų lygiu ir sumažina galimybes pademonstruoti galimus studentų pasiekimų lygius. Universitetas ir Fakultetas turi labiau reklamuoti šią bakalauro programą, nes nepakankamas priimamų studentų skaičius vers uždaryti programą. Ekspertų grupės nuomone, diskusijoje studentai nepademonstravo stiprių kritinių gebėjimų, jų teiginiai neišreiškė aiškios motyvacijos ar siekių, nebuvo nuorodų į šiuolaikinį diskursą ar teoriją. Studentai skatinami dalyvauti ir dalyvauja projektuose, konkursuose ir parodose, vykstančiuose už universiteto ribų, tačiau tai yra problemiška, kai studentai turi mažai savarankiškų studijų galimybių ir šios veiklos programoje nėra įskaitomos. Studentai dalyvauja ERASMUS ir tarptautinėse programose, tačiau dalyvaujančiųjų skaičiai labai maži. Bendravimas su absolventais yra daugiausia neformalus. Visi absolventai pripažino, kad jie neturėjo pakankamai galimybių išsakyti nuomonę apie mokymosi patirties kokybę studijų laikotarpiu ir kad po studijų baigimo į juos nebuvo kreiptasi pagalbos dėl programos tobulinimo.

### **6. Programos vadyba**

Programos komitete yra studentų atstovas, kuris išreiškia studentų požiūrį ir išsako jų pageidavimus. Nuo 2006-7 m.m. renkami studentų priėmimo, sesijų, studijų nutraukimo, programos baigimo duomenys. Taip pat renkami dėstytojų ir studentų mobilumo statistiniai duomenys. Kasmet aptariami programos tikslai, studijų procesas ir jo organizavimas, studentų darbų temos ir vadovai, vertinimo klausimai ir egzaminų rezultatai. Akivaizdžios programos tobulinimo pastangos: programos materialinės bazės pagerėjimas po paskutinio vertinimo 2011m.; dėstytojų kvalifikacijos kėlimui skirti ištekliai; Universiteto inicijuoti geresni Kokybės užtikrinimo ir Vadybos procesai; geresnis bendravimas su socialiniais dalininkais už Universiteto ribų. Palaikomi stiprūs ryšiai su kai kuriomis vietinėmis meno organizacijomis.

Studentai turėtų labiau dalyvauti vertinimo procese ir išsakyti komentarus apie studijų programos kokybę ir turinį. Daugelis programos vertinimo aspektų nesulaukia tinkamo dėmesio ir vertinimui trūksta kiekybinių duomenų. Turėtų būti labiau bendraujama su išorės socialiniais dalininkais, nes daugumai „vietinių“ socialinių dalininkų trūksta nacionalinių/tarptautinių konkurentų žinių ir patirties. Kokybės užtikrinimo ir Vadybos procesai turėtų būti geriau integruoti į programą. Kai kuriuos elementus, tokius kaip programos tinkamumas, studijų organizavimas, bendravimas su esamais studentais, absolventais ir socialiniais dalininkais, programos komitetas turėtų oficialiai peržiūrėti ir panaudoti.

## **III. REKOMENDACIJOS**

Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja:

1. Klaipėdos universitetas ir Fakultetas turėtų toliau įtikinėti Ministeriją pakeisti Nacionalinę priėmimo į aukštąsias mokyklas sistemą, sukurti lygias galimybes šalies viduje ir paremti į visus regionus atsižvelgiančios kultūros strategijas visoje šalyje. Esama sistema labai apsunkina Fakulteto galimybes konkuruoti nacionaliniu ir tarptautiniu mastu. Ekspertų grupė maloniai sutinka, kad siekdamas pokyčių Universitetas remtųsi ekspertų išsakyta nuomone.
2. Programos komitetas ir akademinis personalas turėtų aptarti programos pavadinimą įsigilindami į išdėstytus tikslus ir parinkti tokį pavadinimą, kad būsimiems studentams ir profesinės srities atstovams būtų aišku, kokia yra programos misija, tiek atsižvelgiant į tarpdisciplininėje dailės studijų programoje akcentuojamą tapybą kaip pagrindinę discipliną, tiek į galimą prieštaravimą tarp „regioninės tradicijos“ ir šiuolaikinės tarpdisciplininės praktikos.
3. Fakultetas turėtų apsvarstyti programos komiteto akcentuojamą pedagoginio elemento reikalingumą programoje, kadangi ir studentai, ir absolventai vieningai teigia, kad šis elementas yra nepopuliariausias ir nenaudingiausias jų karjeroje.
4. Ugdyti daugiau profesinių gebėjimų (įskaitant verslumo, pristatymo ir vadybos gebėjimus), kurie padėtų absolventams, kai jie baigia programą ir įsijungia į darbo rinką.
5. Naudoti aiškesnius aprašomuosius modulių pavadinimus vietoje Tapyba I-VII, Skulptūra I-II, Piešimas I-VII, Kompozicija I-VII ir Meno istorija I-IV, kurie padėtų studentams geriau suprasti mokymosi seką, užuot akcentavę procesą.
6. Programos komitetas turėtų užtikrinti, kad kursų turinys atitinka studijų rezultatus ir parengia studentus profesiniam pasauliui, įskaitant:
  - skaitmeninių technologijų naudojimą mokymuisi (e-mokymosi priemonės, pvz., Moodle ir pan.);
  - profesinio augimo gebėjimus (t.y., verslo, verslumo ir vadybos gebėjimus);
  - šiuolaikinį meno ir filosofijos diskursą;
  - skaitmeninės programinės įrangos naudojimo mokymą;
  - kritinio rašymo ir tiriamojo darbo gebėjimus.
7. Studentai anksčiau programoje turėtų prisiimti daugiau atsakomybės, sudarant jiems galimybes savarankiškam mokymuisi ir „rizikavimui“. Dėstytojai turėtų toliau skatinti ir pripažinti studentų dalyvavimą už Universiteto ribų vykstančiuose projektuose, konkursuose ir parodose, o galutiniame vertinime šis dalyvavimas turėtų būti įskaitomas.
8. Atitinkamus programos elementus turėtų dėstyti tinkamos specializacijos dėstytojai, o programos komitetas turėtų peržiūrėti, kas vadovauja studentų baigiamiesiems darbams, kad studentams vadovautų specialistai, galintys išmokyti juos tinkamų tyrimo metodų.
9. Reikalinga didesnė dėstyto turinio įvairovė, kurią galėtų pateikti vizituojantys lektoriai (Lietuvos ir užsienio).
10. Fakultetas turėtų rasti būdų, kaip kompensuoti mažą akademinio personalo kaitą. Reikia tikėtis, kad nauja Fakulteto struktūra sudarys galimybes dėstytojų perėjimui. Taip pat turėtų būti planuojamas akademinio personalo atnaujinimas.
11. Fakultetas turėtų sudaryti sąlygas akademinio personalo kvalifikacijos kėlimui: ugdyti dėstytojų mokymosi ir mokymo strategijas bei metodus ir padėti jiems pradėti taikyti naujas metodikas, įskaitant skaitmenines technologijas ir e-mokymąsi.
12. Studentai turėtų turėti daugiau studijų erdvės praktikai.
13. IT mokymo(si) išteklių naudojimas turėtų būti geriau integruotas į programą. Studijų personalas ir studentai turėtų išmokti geriau panaudoti informacines technologijas kaip mokymo(si) priemones.
14. Programos komitetas turėtų užtikrinti, kad studentai suprastų sąsajas tarp programos modulių turinio bei uždavinių ir programos tikslų.
15. Fakultetas ir programos komitetas turėtų paskirti tinkamus išteklius bendravimui su absolventais, siekiant gauti patarimų dėl programos tobulinimo ir surinkti duomenis apie jų įsidarbinimą.

16. Programos komitetas turėtų siekti didesnio studentų dalyvavimo vertinimo procese.
17. Programos komitetas turėtų atlikti sistemingesnę savianalizę, atidžiau išnagrinėdamas stipriąsias puses (įskaitant išskirtinius bruožus), silpnybes, galimybes ir grėsmes.
18. Tolesnis programos tobulinimas, pvz., tarptautiškumo, tiek studentų, tiek personalo mobilumo prasme, kas reikalauja papildomos Universiteto paramos ir programos turinio tobulinimo, skiriant daugiau dėmesio šiuolaikiniam meno ir filosofijos diskursui.
19. Programos komitetas turėtų užmegzti daugiau ryšių su nacionaliniais ir užsienio socialiniais dalininkais, kadangi turėtų būti labiau susirūpinta, kaip programa konkuruoja nacionaliniu ir tarptautiniu mastu. Bendradarbiavimas su išorės socialiniais dalininkais turėtų būti žymiai pagerintas.
20. Universitetas ir Fakultetas turėtų nustatyti aiškius ir tinkamus kriterijus, kuriais remiantis būtų galima matuoti programų pasiekimus: sėkmę ir tobulinimo sritis.
21. Universiteto sukurti Kokybės užtikrinimo ir Vadybos procesai ir priemonės turėtų būti geriau integruoti į programą.

<...>

---

Paslaugos teikėja patvirtina, jog yra susipažinusi su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso<sup>1</sup> 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)

---

<sup>1</sup> Žin., 2002, Nr.37-1341.