



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Klaipėdos universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS VAIDYBA
(*valstybinis kodas – 612W41006*)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF ACTING (*state code – 612W41006*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Klaipėda University

Experts' team:

1. **Prof. dr. Jonathan Pitches (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. dr. João Mário Grilo,** *academic,*
3. **Dr. Daniela Jobertova,** *academic,*
4. **Doc. dr. Vida Kazragytė,** *academic,*
5. **Ms Renata Klimiata,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator – Ms Eimantė Gečytė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2015

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

| | |
|--|--|
| Studijų programos pavadinimas | <i>Vaidyba</i> |
| Valstybinis kodas | 612W41006 |
| Studijų sritis | Menai |
| Studijų kryptis | Teatras ir kinas |
| Studijų programos rūšis | Universitetinės studijos |
| Studijų pakopa | pirmoji |
| Studijų forma (trukmė metais) | Nuolatinė (4) |
| Studijų programos apimtis kreditais | 240 |
| Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija | Teatro bakalauras |
| Studijų programos įregistravimo data | Programa įregistruota: 2003-05-29 (ĮSAK. 763) Perregistruota: 2007-11-30 (ĮSAK. 2321) Suteiktas naujas kodas: 2010-05-03 (V-635) |

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

| | |
|---|--|
| Title of the study programme | <i>Acting</i> |
| State code | 612W41006 |
| Study area | Art studies |
| Study field | Theatre and film |
| Type 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 Theatre |
| Date of registration of the study programme | Registered on 29 -05-2003(ĮSAK. 763) Re registered on 30-11-2007 (ĮSAK. 2321) New state codes granted 03-05-2010 (V-635) |

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

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| 1.1. Background of the evaluation process | 4 |
| 1.2. General | 4 |
| 1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information | 4 |
| 1.4. The Review Team | 6 |
| II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS | 6 |
| 2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes | 6 |
| 2.2. Curriculum design | 7 |
| 2.3. Teaching staff | 10 |
| 2.4. Facilities and learning resources | 11 |
| 2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment | 12 |
| 2.6. Programme management | 14 |
| III. RECOMMENDATIONS | 16 |
| IV. SUMMARY | 17 |
| V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT | 20 |

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

The evaluation of on-going study programmes is based on the **Methodology for evaluation of Higher Education study programmes**, approved by Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereafter – SKVC).

The evaluation is intended to help higher education institutions to constantly improve their study programmes and to inform the public about the quality of studies.

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: *1) self-evaluation and self-evaluation report prepared by Higher Education Institution (hereafter – HEI); 2) visit of the review team at the higher education institution; 3) production of the evaluation report by the review team and its publication; 4) follow-up activities.*

On the basis of external evaluation report of the study programme SKVC takes a decision to accredit study programme either for 6 years or for 3 years. If the programme evaluation is negative such a programme is not accredited.

The programme is **accredited for 6 years** if all evaluation areas are evaluated as “very good” (4 points) or “good” (3 points).

The programme is **accredited for 3 years** if none of the areas was evaluated as “unsatisfactory” (1 point) and at least one evaluation area was evaluated as “satisfactory” (2 points).

The programme is **not accredited** if at least one of evaluation areas was evaluated as "unsatisfactory" (1 point).

1.2. General

The Application documentation submitted by the HEI follows the outline recommended by the SKVC. Along with the self-evaluation report and annexes, the following additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit:

| No. | Name of the document |
|-----|----------------------|
| | |
| | |

1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information

The procedures of the external evaluation of Klaipėda University Bachelor study programme in Acting were initiated by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education of Lithuania nominating the external evaluation peer group identified below.

For the evaluation of study programme the following documents have been considered:

- Law on Higher Education and Research of Republic of Lithuania;
- Procedure of the External Evaluation and Accreditation of Study Programmes;
- General Requirements of the First Degree and Integrated Study Programmes;
- Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes.

The basis for the evaluation of the study programme is the Self-Evaluation Report (SER), prepared in 2014, its annexes and the site visit of the expert group to the University on 13th April 2015.

The visit incorporated all required meetings with different groups: the appropriate administrative staff, staff responsible for preparing the self-evaluation documents, teaching staff, students of all years of study, graduates and stakeholders. The experts' group evaluated various support services (classrooms, studios, library, computer facilities), examined students' final works, and various other materials. After the expert group discussions and additional preparations of conclusions and remarks, introductory general conclusions of the visit were presented. After the visit, the group met to discuss and agree the content of the report, which represents the expert team's consensual views.

Klaipėda University was founded on 1st January 1991 on the basis of divisions of other higher education institutions in Klaipėda. KU is now a centre of science and culture in the region of Western Lithuania (with 650 thousand inhabitants). The university is managed by the Council and the Senate. It has more than 500 teachers and approximately 6.5 thousand students. The University organises the studies of all three cycles (Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral).

Founded in 1971, the Faculty of Arts is one of the seven faculties in the University which enjoys academic, economic and financial autonomy. Presently, the Faculty of Arts consists of 7 departments and the Institute of Musicology. It prepares specialists of music, theatre, dance and art. The Acting study programme is administrated by the Theatre Department, which was established in 1975. The Department organises Acting and Directing BA study programmes and a Directing MA programme.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. 1-01-151 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *13th April 2015*.

- 1. Prof. dr. Jonathan Pitches (team leader)** *University of Leeds, Chair in Theatre and Performance, School of Performance and Cultural Industries, United Kingdom.*
- 2. Prof. dr. João Mário Grilo**, *New University of Lisbon, Professor of Social and Human Sciences Faculty, Portugal.*
- 3. Assoc. Prof. Daniela Jobertová**, *Academy of Performing Arts, Head of the Department of Theory and Criticism, Czech Republic.*
- 4. Assoc. Prof. Vida Kazragytė**, *Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, Associate Professor of Arts Education Department, Lithuania.*
- 5. Ms Renata Klimiata**, *student of Vilnius Gediminas Technical University study programme Multimedia Design.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The BA in Acting at Klaipėda University (hereinafter – KU) was last evaluated in 2011 when the evaluation team made 10 recommendations for improvement to the programme. These are comprehensively set out in the SER (pp.5-7). Acting sits within the long established Theatre Department created in 1975, in the Faculty of Arts. Since the last evaluation Faculty and Programme teams have worked to diversify the acting provision locally (Klaipėda Drama and Youth theatres), have appointed several new tutors – at both ends of the experience continuum - and have devised a one-year International Directors course. These changes have made an evident positive impact on the provision for students, and particularly the appointment of an internationally recognised programme leader.

The central aims of the programme are three fold: “to train actors, who know methods of effectual analysis of actors’ creativity and works of drama; to train actors, who can apply the acquired knowledge in the process of creating parts; in cultural, project activity; to train actors, who are able to independently and professionally create roles in theatre and film” (p. 10). These aims are realised through 19 Learning Outcomes considered, firstly, in terms of the common descriptors: Knowledge, Research, Special abilities, Social abilities and Personal abilities; and secondly (with some imprecision) as a mapping exercise between Programme Objectives and

Programme Learning outcomes (hereinafter – PLOs). The second exercise in the SER is less instructive compared to the more granular analysis, citing key components of the programme, on page 16. Some learning outcomes are expressed in detailed terms for instance “A3: knows the harmony of components of actors’ creativity: stage speech, makes, theatrical singing, body plasticity” (p.9). Others are much more generic, particularly those relating to ‘the ability to conduct research’: e.g. ‘B1: Is able to summarise facts and phenomena, draw conclusions, provide recommendations’ (p.9). During the visit the staff team were able to articulate the connections between the main PLOs and the subject-level outcomes very effectively – a function of good preparation and a positive outcome of a 4 day period of staff development dedicated to mapping these relationships. There were, though, areas of development identified, specifically in terms of the assessment regime for, and critical underpinning of, Final Thesis, neither of which were clear to the experts.

Both the Programme Aims and the learning outcomes are compliant with Lithuanian Qualifications Framework Level VI and the recognized First Cycle of Studies of the Framework of Qualifications in the European HE area. Programme Aims and expected Learning outcomes are published on the AIKOS website and on the KU website. They are also shared internally (p.11). There are many opportunities for learning outcomes to be reviewed, through student surveys, periodic meetings of teachers, graduate surveys and meetings with industry partners.

Stakeholders were clearly invested in the programme and had positively influenced developments within it – there was a clear route for a significant segment of the cohort into a new Klaipėda Youth theatre. Overall, it was clear from the site visit that KU’s Acting programme aims and LEOs are based on public needs and are responsive to the labour market.

Strengths observed in this area were the well-qualified and well-connected staff team, ideally placed to help students realise the Learning outcomes and the coherence of the thinking behind the PLO’s. A weakness was in articulating in specific terms the research skills needed and in identifying the assessment regime for the Final Thesis.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design of the Programme meets the legal requirements that regulate such studies. In scope it consists of 240 credits, duration 4 years (requirement no more than 240 credits). The subjects of General University studies consist of 21 credits (requirement no less than 15 credits), subjects of the Study field consist of 189 credits (requirement no less 165 credits), subjects

defined by the University and optionally chosen by the student consist of 30 credits (requirement no more than 60 credits). 39 credits are assigned to practice which is included in the acting subject (SER, p. 16) (requirement no less 15 credits). The scope of credits devoted to the Final thesis is not sufficiently clear as it is not excluded from studies as a separate item. According to the SER (p. 12) it consists of 24 credits (requirement no less 12 credits). As can be seen from the annex “Descriptions of the subjects of the study programme“ it is integrated in the subject “Acting (Graduation Paper – Performance)” with a value of 24 credits (p. 102). But according to SER (p. 16) the time of Acting (Final Play) is smaller - 15 credits. During the visit, the time allocated to Final thesis was also verbally referred to as 15 credits. The number of subjects within a semester is 5 or 7 (requirement not more than 7). The minimum scope of the study subject is 3 credits (requirement no less than 3 credits). The subjects are organized per 30 credits in semester.

The scope of the study programme is sufficient to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The learning outcomes of the subjects are carefully mapped across the programme and there is a good sense of academic coherence. The subjects within the study plan are clearly oriented towards the formation of acting skills. Semesters 1-4 focus on different skills of stage performance (speech, singing, rhythm, movement, etc.). In the last semesters, students develop their artistic abilities further, by choosing subjects of specialisation, gaining acting practice, studying elective subjects. So, there is a strong emphasis on Acting as a core subject; in the scope it consists of 10 credits (in 1-6 semesters) and 15 credits in the 8th semester, while overall the other subjects seem to be complementary to the acting (3 or 4 credits in scope, per semester). Students improve skills in acting by the regular practising of role creation in about 14 performances staged during the whole of their studies. This can be considered a reasonable characteristic of the concentration of the curriculum, justified by the aims of the programme to educate a professional actor. However, as the visit revealed, there is a need for a more balanced curriculum design, by embedding knowledge of history, philosophy and other subjects of general education in order to encourage the wider development and cultural sophistication of the young prospective actors. The potential for more connection with the film industry and the wider cultural industries is also lacking in the curriculum design at present.

The system of specialisation was introduced in 2012 by taking into account the external reviewers’ recommendations (from the 2011 assessment). Students in semesters V-VI can choose for this purpose, such subjects: 1) Directing of Events, Dramaturgy of the Events; 2) Directing of Puppet Theatre, Puppet Production; 3) Theatre Directing, Scenography, 4) Acting

Laboratory (12 credits). These subjects have alternatives: event directing, event dramaturgy; or puppet theatre directing, puppet creation. The trends of specialisation are oriented towards acquiring directing skills for prospective actors' and can be considered to be useful for widening their workplace prospects. But as far as the programme aims to prepare actors for the regional theatres, specialisations to expand further the various skills of acting, for example, singing, might be also considered, as was suggested during the site visit.

The descriptions of the subjects give thorough information about the topics and the outcomes. Each subject has a clearly different theme and the themes are thus not repetitive. The themes of the subjects are relevant and cover important areas, according to the aims and outcomes of the programme. Also, it is clear that the subjects provide students with the knowledge, skills and competences according to the First Cycle of qualification.

A variety of study methods are reflected in the descriptions of subjects: exercises, group and individual projects, practical tasks, debates, discussions, presentations of a literature review, individual/group consultations, creative workshops, etc. The latest achievements in theatre art are reflected in a relevant way. The references given in the subject descriptions are updated, oriented towards a favourable balance between eastern (Russian) and western modern literature of theatre art and theatre pedagogy.

According to the reviewers' recommendations (2011), 3 main criteria of assessment were introduced in 2014: student's contribution to the overall creative work, student's personal/professional progress, quality of the student's shown result during an exam (SER, p. 6). But the assessment criteria could be made more open and transparent within the subjects and especially within the Final Thesis: for instance the specifications for the examined roles in Final Play and the criteria for written texts evaluation. Aspect of qualitative research could emerge more in the writing part, as during the site visit the team observed predominantly descriptive approaches to this task.

Strengths observed in this area were the clear focus on acting skills and the intensity of the student experience. Weaknesses were to do with the lack of clarity over the criteria for assessing Final Thesis and the need to embed more philosophy and history into the curriculum.

2.3. Teaching staff

Globally speaking, the staff assessment is positive, as are the positive measures implemented since the last evaluation to strengthen the artistic potential and staff qualification and to improve the teachers' turnover – notably, the employment of 6 new and younger teachers, some of them with research and creative interests in strategic specialized domains such as puppet theatre or stage dancing.

However, the recruitment of these new lecturers was endogamous and somewhat precipitated by the external reviewer's recommendation in 2011. All of them were invited to become part of the teaching staff as graduates from the MA programme. There was no national or international competition for the fulfilment of these positions and no academic or scientific specifications were defined beyond the artistic specializations of each of these new members and their traditional affiliation with the University and the programme.

In numeric terms, the staff complies largely with the Lithuanian legislation on artistic studies, as 100% of the teachers have a regular artistic practice – some of them with extremely relevant curriculums - counting more than 3 years experience in their artistic domain. Also, the majority of the teaching staff has a large teaching experience, with 50% of teachers having more than 25 years experience in teaching activities.

As it is stated by the SER “active artistic activity of teachers is closely related with their taught subjects (acting, directing, stage language, stage movement, singing, etc.). “, and there is substantial evidence that this integration leads to the involvement of students in a direct comprehension of the creative process, notably in its practical dimensions. Also the general ratio of 1:7 is adequate to the accomplishment of the Programme learning objectives.

In terms of teacher's graduation and scientific publication, the assessment team felt strongly that the Programme should be more developed and assertive, as only 3 teachers have published “methodological works” with some regularity. This is certainly a measure to be reinforced given the recent turnover of staff and a benchmark for new lecturers considering the necessity to publish or to participate in methodological works, in accordance with the Decision No 11-48 of Klaipėda University Senate “*KU Description of Certification and Organisation of a Competition to Fill a Position of Teachers, Academic Staff and Researchers*” of 5 April 2013. The Programme management should implement practical measures to support staff publication to enhance the status of the institution and to enable the future development of the Programme.

During the visit to the institution new lecturers did not seem sufficiently aware of the significance of this research policy to the national and international development of the University.

The staff structure and identity of this Programme is characterized by a supportive atmosphere, represented by strong links between older and more experienced team members and the group of young lecturers, all seeming to follow the same and well identified path, with a clear understanding of the philosophy of the Programme, as well as of its history and tradition. This circumstance, however, should not overshadow the potential challenge that always represents a new generation of teachers to the ecology of a University, being the scientific research - along with the artistic creation - a significant instrument for the modernization and internationalization of the Programme in its near future.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The provision of space and of learning resources for the BA in Acting at KU was not easily understood in the SER. The Faculty provision is defined as 11 classrooms plus one Educational Theatre and 'all of them are used' by students (p.24). It was not clear what, if any, pressure is brought to bear on these spaces by students studying subjects beyond the BA Acting programme. The SER stated clearly that 'the number of the premises is not sufficient for theatre study' (p.24) but this was contested by Faculty representatives who argued that numbers of rooms *were* sufficient even if the specification of them was not adequate. In the opinion of the experts, some resource improvements were evident but these were not yet fully impacting on the student experience, and there was an indistinct timetable for the rest of the improvements. Access to the facilities for the students is generous, though - with early (7am) and late (up to 10pm) access provided.

Some renovation for older spaces has been undertaken over the last few years and six auditoria have been recently refurbished. Equipment details are not exhaustive in the SER and it remained unclear after the site visit what level of technology is available to students on an *individual* basis. Access to cameras, recorders, digital projectors, specialised lighting and sound equipment was not generous and the booking processes are informal, if not *ad hoc*. Students did not find this a problem, however, and were happy with the arrangements to negotiate access to spaces with their peers. The site visit facilitated access to all the spaces used by students on the Programme and refurbishment activity (starting on the top level of the building) was clearly being undertaken and demonstrably improving things. There was not an explicit strategy going forward

for further development, beyond the verbal undertaking that the refurbishments were being done floor by floor (descending).

Learning resources are housed conveniently - in the Central Klaipėda University Library - and include a good book stock, electronic documents, e-journals and the Emigration Culture and Art archive. Subscription to a very large number of e-databases (peaking at 53 in 2012) is evident, and several are of international e-publishing houses. There are many designated reading rooms for students and a commitment to the development of literacy skills. Whilst the accommodation for the learning resources was quite antiquated, the Acting, Theatre and related reading materials were wide ranging and housed together –maximising access for students.

The strengths of the Facilities and Learning Resources of KU include the on-going renovation of the Faculty of Arts premises and the well-stocked provision of the library (p.26). Weaknesses relate to the challenges faced by the programme team in providing space and resources for individual creative work and consultations as well as the lack of an explicit strategy for further refurbishment and development – only a small section of the spaces viewed meet contemporary expectations for this kind of practical work and this is clearly an important priority going forward.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The main admission criteria to the Acting study programme are related to entrance examinations and grades of School Leaving Examinations. The structure of the enrolment examination and all tasks for each round are understandable and conform to Lithuanian admission regulations. However, during the visit it was evident that most of the students had little or no understanding of what they were going to do during their studies, and this could be the consequence of the lack of information about student activity on the website of the department.

Taking evidence together from the SER and the visit, the Acting study programme is coherent and provides the necessary conditions for the provision of the programme and the achievement of its learning outcomes. Acting is compartmentalised into 5 skill areas: Acting, Stage speech, Dance, Stage rhythm and Movement and these are developed and deepened over the 8 semesters of the Programme. Philosophy, theatre history and psychology augment this offer but the extent to which these areas are given room fully to influence the practical work was under debate within the course team.

Students have the possibility to participate in artistic activity. Students independently organise performances in Lithuania and abroad as well (students curated a Youth theatre festival by themselves, for example). Some students' performances were shown in 15 Lithuanian towns and - during the tours of 2012 and 2013 - in France and Austria. Stakeholders actively participate in students' lives during all four study years, an essential preparation for their future jobs. During the site visit, students reported that they were glad to have the possibility to learn different techniques from famous directors.

Student opportunities to participate in mobility programmes are limited because of students' unwillingness to suspend intensive studies. On the other hand, students are glad to participate in shorter Erasmus practice exchange programmes – in 2013, 13 students of the Department participated in this programme, for example.

Academic and social support appears to be effective. Most of the important information about their studies, faculty and university departments and their respective functions are given to students during the first study weeks. Students participate in the meetings with Programme administration and there are close formal and informal communications between students and staff – individual and group face-face feedback sessions, evaluation questionnaires, post production reflections.

Skills and knowledge are evaluated on the basis of a criteria-based ten-point scoring system and an accumulative assessment. The structure of the cumulative assessment score ensures a more comprehensive and objective evaluation. Students are satisfied by the feedback system during individual and group discussions, when they find out their marks, get feedback on their performances and face up to their weaknesses and strengths. The main criteria of evaluation are 1) self-progress, 2) input into a creative process and 3) the quality of final performance. However, the staff team could work to improve the clarity of these criteria and to make explicit the expectations that underpin them. For instance, how is self-progress distinguished from input into creative process? And how many sub criteria for quality of performance are made clear to students in advance of the practical assessments?

Most of the graduates are employed in drama theatres in Lithuania and Latvia. Those, who decided to continue their studies in Master's studies, can be trained for future work as teachers for BA students of the Acting study programme. Stakeholders are waiting for more graduates,

which indicates a perceived need for actors in the region. Students believe that they are well prepared to create their own theatre after graduating.

Strengths in this area are the intensity of the practical training; the quality of the work which is produced by students and the effective communication between students and teachers, with a good balance of informal and formal feedback. Weaknesses are in the assessment processes which could be more open and in the publicising of recent work by students, using the University website for instance.

2.6. Programme management

Klaipėda University has established a Quality Management Model which seems to ensure a correct functioning of the self-evaluation of study programmes. Three levels of management are connected and inter-related: the University level, the Faculty level and the Department level. At all these levels, responsibilities are defined according to the status and the founding documents of the University. Major external documents that are used as a basis for quality management are the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality of Higher Education, ISO 9001 and 1401, OH SAS 18001 and SA 8000. Since the last evaluation in 2011, Klaipėda University has made substantial improvement in its internal quality management system, implementing many of recommendations of the expert team.

The Department of Theatre Studies, which is responsible for the delivery of the Acting study programme, collects various types of data (quantitative data on artistic, research and mobility activities) and encourages students' feedback on their study experience. The programme has a functioning system of evaluations, monitoring and reporting, the system of committees is developed, and there is a reasonable balance between formal and informal feedback data gathering. As a response to the external reviewer's recommendation in 2011 "to create and conduct systematic student and teacher surveys", the Programme implemented, among other more informal measures an anonymous student survey about the quality of the programme through the KU Faculty of Arts Students' Union.

The quality issues are addressed by the Study Quality Committee and Certification Committee (teachers' approval) on the University level, and by the Acting Study Programme Committee and Study Modules Certification Committee (courses' approval) on the Faculty level. Based on the previous evaluation recommendation, the University decided to appoint a programme leader, prof. Valentinas Masalskis, who is at the same time one of the year leaders. The site visit

confirmed that the programme's main philosophy is the "master-pupil approach"; the alumni's experience seems to suggest that the future success of graduates depends very much on the prestige of the year leader. Therefore, the management should make steps in order to assure that all students have both comparable and manifold study experience (ideally opening them towards different theatre aesthetics), and equitable prospects for future employment, based solely on their acquired competencies and skills. Yet, the expert team praises the current management – and especially the programme leader – for establishing the Klaipėda Youth Theatre as a platform where fresh graduates can get their first truly professional experience.

The staff is engaged on recommendation and, subsequently, on the Dean's order; after one year of successful pedagogic work a teacher can present him/herself for a post for 5 years. Yet, there is no truly open competition, which tends to confirm and perpetuate the existing model. The management is strongly advised to create a context for a more open personnel policy, and also motivate teaching body for continuing improvement not only in and through their artistic practise, but also through the reflexion of this practise and the research. The promising young staff should be encouraged to transform their artistic practice into research and deepen their pedagogical and methodological qualification.

During the site visit, almost all internal stakeholders (teachers and students) insisted on the fact that international experience is a problematic issue, given the fact that students hesitate to leave the programme during their studies for fear of losing connection with the professional sphere. Still, the management should work towards a more intense use of all possibilities embedded in the new Erasmus+ programme (strategic partnerships, common projects, individual traineeships) in order to offer students a more varied experience; this would undoubtedly also serve as a tool for better benchmarking on a larger, even European and international, scale.

The site visit also confirmed that social partners are involved in the actual course of studies and satisfied with the competencies of graduates, but not sufficiently engaged in the improvement process itself, i.e. in the programme design and conception. The institution is aware of this drawback and seems to be working towards an improvement. In 2014 a roundtable with stakeholders was organized, it would be useful to make this discussion with social partners a regular input into the process of the programme re-design; also, stakeholders other than theatre directors might be involved, as the acting profession is closely connected with other media (especially film and television).

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To make more available for public view the recent work of students, using mechanisms such as the University website.
2. To ensure the strategic and consistent promotion of research and methodological publication for all staff on the programme, implementing practical measures to support staff publication to enhance the status of the institution and to enable the future development of the Programme.
3. To continue to enhance the resource infrastructure - especially in terms of the work-spaces observed which have not yet undergone refurbishment and in terms of providing space for individual work, where necessary.
4. To establish a more open competition and embed an inclusive recruitment policy into the Programme, going forward.
5. To consider the need for a more systematic approach to embedding history, philosophy and research into the curriculum, and especially in respect of the final thesis
6. To develop a more strategic internationalisation campaign and to make the programme as flexible as possible to enable students to take up international opportunities.
7. To determine a stronger distinction between the external practical work of students and their degree work, whilst retaining the benefits of stakeholder partnership and professional practice.
8. To make the assessment processes and criteria more open to students and to encourage qualitative research approaches across the curriculum and especially for the final thesis (in terms of the latter - the specifications for the examined roles in Final Play and the criteria for the written texts evaluation).
9. To consider the potential for more connections with film and television and to extend the stakeholder community to include the wider cultural industries.

IV. SUMMARY

The BA in Acting at Klaipėda University (KU) was last evaluated in 2011 when the evaluation team made 10 recommendations for improvement to the programme. Acting sits within the long established Theatre Department created in 1975, in the Faculty of Arts. Since the last evaluation Faculty and Programme teams have worked to diversify the acting provision, locally (Klaipėda Drama and Youth theatres), have appointed several new tutors – at both ends of the experience continuum and have devised a one-year International Directors course. Stakeholders were clearly invested in the programme and had positively influenced developments within it – there was a clear route for a significant segment of the cohort into a new Klaipėda Youth theatre.

The staff team is well-qualified and well-connected, ideally placed to help students realise the Programme Learning outcomes which are coherent and collectively owned. There remains a need for the programme team to articulate in specific terms the research skills needed for the programme and to identify the assessment regime for the Final Thesis. The staff is engaged on recommendation and, subsequently, on the Dean's order; after one year of successful pedagogic work a teacher can present him/herself for a post for 5 years. Yet, there is no truly open competition, which tends to confirm and perpetuate the existing model. The management is strongly advised to create a context for a more open personnel policy, and also motivate teaching body for continuing improvement not only in and through their artistic practise, but also through the reflexion of this practise and the research. The promising young staff should be encouraged to transform their artistic practice into research and deepen their pedagogical and methodological qualification.

The main admission criteria to the Acting study programme are related to entrance examinations and grades of School Leaving Examinations. The structure of the enrolment examination and all tasks for each round are understandable and conform to Lithuanian admission regulations. However, during the visit it was evident that most of the students had little or no understanding of what they were going to do during their studies, and this could be the consequence of the lack of information about student activity on the website of the department. The learning outcomes of the subjects are carefully mapped across the programme and there is a good sense of academic coherence. The subjects within the study plan are clearly oriented towards the formation of acting skills. In the last semesters, students develop their artistic abilities further, by choosing subjects of specialisation. Students improve skills in acting by the regular practising of role

creation in about 14 performances staged during the whole of their studies. This is a reasonable characteristic of the concentration of the curriculum, justified by the aims of the programme to educate a professional actor. However, as the visit revealed, there is a need for a more balanced curriculum design, by embedding knowledge of history, philosophy and other subjects of general education in order to encourage the wider development and cultural sophistication of the young prospective actors.

Skills and knowledge are evaluated on the basis of a criteria-based ten-point scoring system and an accumulative assessment. The structure of the cumulative assessment score ensures a more comprehensive and objective evaluation. Students are satisfied by the feedback system during individual and group discussions, when they find out their marks, get feedback on their performances and face up to their weaknesses and strengths. The main criteria of evaluation are 1) self-progress, 2) input into a creative process and 3) the quality of final performance. However, the staff team could work to improve the clarity of these criteria and to make explicit the expectations that underpin them. For instance, how is self-progress distinguished from input into creative process? And how many sub criteria for quality of performance are made clear to students in advance of the practical assessments?

Globally speaking, the staff assessment is positive, as are the positive measures implemented since the last evaluation to strengthen the artistic potential and staff qualification and to improve the teachers' turnover – notably, the employment of 6 new and younger teachers with creative interests in strategic specialized domains such as puppet theatre or stage dancing. In terms of teacher's graduation and scientific publication, the assessment team felt strongly that the Programme should be more developed and assertive, as only 3 teachers have published "methodological works" with some regularity.

The SER stated clearly that 'the number of the premises is not sufficient for theatre study' (p.24) but this was contested by Faculty representatives who argued that numbers of rooms *were* sufficient even if the specification of them was not adequate. In the opinion of the experts, some resource improvements were evident but these were not yet fully impacting on the student experience, and there was an indistinct timetable for the rest of the improvements. The strengths of the Facilities and Learning Resources of KU include the on-going renovation of the Faculty of Arts premises and the well-stocked provision of the library (p.26). Weaknesses relate to the challenges faced by the programme team in providing space and resources for individual creative work and consultations as well as the lack of an explicit strategy for further refurbishment and

development – only a small section of the spaces viewed meet contemporary expectations and this is clearly an important priority going forward.

Student opportunities to participate in mobility programmes are limited because of students' unwillingness to suspend intensive studies. On the other hand, students are glad to participate in shorter Erasmus practice exchange programmes – in 2013, 13 students of the Department participated in this programme, for example.

The site visit confirmed that social partners are involved in the actual course of studies and satisfied with the competencies of graduates, but not sufficiently engaged in the improvement process itself, i.e. in the programme design and conception. The institution is aware of this drawback and seems to be working towards an improvement. In 2014 a roundtable with stakeholders was organized, it would be useful to make this discussion with social partners a regular input into the process of the programme re-design; also, stakeholders other than theatre directors might be involved, as the acting profession is closely connected with other media (especially film and television).

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Acting* (state code – 612W41006) at Klaipėda University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

| No. | Evaluation Area | Evaluation of an area in points* |
|-----|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. | Programme aims and learning outcomes | 3 |
| 2. | Curriculum design | 3 |
| 3. | Teaching staff | 3 |
| 4. | Facilities and learning resources | 2 |
| 5. | Study process and students' performance assessment | 3 |
| 6. | Programme management | 2 |
| | Total: | 16 |

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

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

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

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

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Grupės vadovas: Team leader: | Prof. dr. Jonathan Pitches |
| Grupės nariai: Team members: | Prof. dr. João Mário Grilo |
| | Dr. Daniela Jobertova |
| | Doc. dr. Vida Kazragytė |
| | Ms Renata Klimiato |

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
VAIDYBA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612W41006) 2015-06-25 EKSPERTINIO
VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-170 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Vaidyba* (valstybinis kodas – 612W41006) vertinama teigiamai.

| Eil. Nr. | Vertinimo sritis | Srities įvertinimas, balais* |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai | 3 |
| 2. | Programos sandara | 3 |
| 3. | Personalas | 3 |
| 4. | Materialieji ištekliai | 2 |
| 5. | Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas | 3 |
| 6. | Programos vadyba | 2 |
| | Iš viso: | 16 |

* 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)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Klaipėdos universiteto (KU) bakalauro studijų programa *Vaidyba* paskutinį kartą vertinta 2011 m. Tuomet ekspertų grupė pateikė 10 rekomendacijų programai tobulinti. Studijų programą *Vaidyba* vykdo Menų fakulteto Teatro katedra, įkurta 1975 m. Nuo paskutinio vertinimo fakulteto ir studijų programos darbuotojai tobulino ir įvairino vaidybos programos vykdymą vietoje (Klaipėdos dramos ir Jaunimo teatruose) – paskyrė keletą naujų kuratorių, siekdami

užtikrinti nenutrūkstamą patirtį, ir sugalvojo vienų metų tarptautinį režisierių kursą. Aiškiai pastebimas socialinių dalininkų indėlis programoje, turėjęs teigiamą įtaką jos tobulinimui, matyti aiškus siekis sukurti kursą naujame Klaipėdos jaunimo teatre.

Dėstytojų kvalifikacija gera, jie turi gerų ryšių ir gali puikiai padėti studentams suvokti programos studijų rezultatus, kurie yra nuoseklūs ir bendrai pripažįstami. Programą vykdančiams dėstytojams belieka specifiniais terminais išreikšti mokslinių tyrimų įgūdžius, kurių reikia programai vykdyti, ir nustatyti baigiamųjų darbų vertinimo režimą. Darbuotojai priimami pagal rekomendacijas, po to tvirtinami dekanų įsakymu. Po vienų sėkmingo pedagoginio darbo metų dėstytojas gali pretenduoti į pareigas penkeriems metams. Vis dėlto tai nėra atviras konkursas, kuris padėtų įtvirtinti ir palaikyti esamą modelį. Vadovybei patariama sukurti atviresnę personalo politiką, taip pat motyvuoti dėstytojus nuolat kelti kvalifikaciją ne tik per meninę praktiką, bet ir šios praktikos parodymą ir mokslinius tyrimus. Perspektyvius jaunos dėstytojus reikia skatinti perkelti meninę praktiką į mokslinius tyrimus ir kelti pedagoginę ir metodinę kvalifikaciją.

Pagrindiniai priėmimo į studijų programą *Vaidyba* kriterijai susiję su stojamaisiais egzaminais ir mokyklos baigiamųjų egzaminų balais. Stojamųjų egzaminų struktūra ir visos kiekvieno etapo užduotys yra suprantamos ir atitinka Lietuvos priėmimo taisyklės. Tačiau per apsilankymą universitete paaiškėjo, kad dauguma studentų menkai suprato arba visiškai nesuprato, ką jie turėtų daryti per studijas, ir taip galėjo nutikti dėl informacijos apie studentų veiklą stokos katedros interneto svetainėje. Dalykų studijų rezultatai visoje studijų programoje kruopščiai suplanuoti, vyrauja tinkamas akademinis nuoseklumas. Dalykai studijų plane aiškiai orientuoti į vaidybos įgūdžių formavimą. Paskutiniuosiuose semestruose studentai formuoja meninius gebėjimus, pasirinkdami specializacijos dalykus. Studentai tobulina vaidybos įgūdžius nuolat praktikuodamiesi ir kurdami vaidmenis maždaug 14 spektaklių, kurie statomi per visą studijų laikotarpį. Tai svarbi studijų programos sandaros ypatybė, kurią pateisina programos tikslas – parengti profesionalų aktorių. Tačiau per apsilankymą paaiškėjo, kad reikia parengti labiau subalansuotą programos sandarą įtraukiant istorijos, filosofijos ir kitų bendrojo lavinimo dalykų žinias, kurios skatintų platesnį jaunų perspektyvių aktorių išsilavinimą ir kultūrinį išprusimą.

Gebėjimai ir žinios vertinami pagal kriterijais grindžiamą dešimties balų vertinimo sistemą ir kaupiamuoju vertinimu. Kaupiamojo vertinimo balo sistema užtikrina išsamesnį ir objektyvesnį vertinimą. Studentai patenkinti grįžtamojo ryšio sistema, taikoma per individualias ir grupines diskusijas, kuomet jie sužino savo balus, gauna atsiliepimų apie spektaklius ir informuojami apie savo trūkumus bei privalumus. Pagrindiniai vertinimo kriterijai: 1) savarankiška pažanga,

2) indėlis į kūrybinį procesą ir 3) baigiamojo vaidinimo kokybę. Tačiau personalas galėtų aiškiau apibrėžti šiuos kriterijus ir tiksliau numatyti lūkesčius, kuriais jie grindžiami. Pavyzdžiui, kuo savarankiška pažanga skiriasi nuo indėlio į kūrybinį procesą? Kiek vaidinimo kokybės subkriterijų studentai tiksliai žino iš anksto prieš praktinį vertinimą?

Bendrai kalbant, personalas vertinimas teigiamai. Po paskutinio vertinimo įgyvendintos teigiamos priemonės siekiant stiprinti meno potencialą, tobulinti personalo kvalifikaciją ir gerinti dėstytojų kaitą. Visų pirma įdarbinti šeši jaunesni dėstytojai, turintys kūrybinių interesų strategiškai specializuotose srityse, kaip lėlių teatras ar sceninis šokis. Kalbant apie dėstytojų laipsnius ir mokslo publikacijas, ekspertų grupė aiškiai pajuto, kad šioje srityje programą reikėtų tobulinti ir stiprinti, nes metodinę medžiagą tam tikru reguliarumu skelbia tik 3 dėstytojai.

Savianalizės suvestinėje aiškiai pasakyta, kad „patalpų skaičius teatro studijoms nėra pakankamas“ (24 p.), tačiau fakulteto atstovai tai užginčijo – jų teigimu, patalpų pakanka, nors jų sąlygos neadekvačios. Ekspertų nuomone, kai kurie išteklių patobulinimai akivaizdūs, tačiau jie nelabai turi poveikį studentų patirčiai, o tolesnių gerinimo darbų planas nėra aiškus. KU materialijų išteklių stiprybės – vykstanti Menų fakulteto patalpų renovacija ir gerai aprūpintos bibliotekos sukūrimas (26 p.). Silpnybės susijusios su iššūkiais, su kuriais susiduria programos personalas suteikdamas patalpas ir išteklius individualiam kūrybiniam darbui ir konsultacijoms, taip pat nėra aiškios tolesnio atnaujinimo ir plėtros strategijos ir tik nedidelė dalis apžiūrėtų patalpų atitinka šiuolaikinius lūkesčius. Šiam klausimui ateityje turi būti skiriamas aiškus prioritetas.

Studentų galimybės dalyvauti judumo programose ribotos dėl studentų nenoro stabdyti intensyviai studijas. Kita vertus, studentai mielai dalyvauja trumpalaikėse *Erasmus* praktikos mainų programose. Pavyzdžiui, 2013 m. šioje programoje dalyvavo trylika katedros studentų.

Per apsilankymą pasitvirtino, kad socialiniai partneriai iš tikrųjų dalyvauja studijų programoje ir yra patenkinti absolventų kompetencija, tačiau nepakankamai įtraukiami į patį tobulinimo procesą, t. y. programos ir koncepcijos rengimo veiklą. Aukštoji mokykla žino šį trūkumą ir, atrodo, imasi veiksmų jam pašalinti. 2014 m. organizuota apskritojo stalo diskusija su socialiniais dalininkais. Būtų naudinga tokias diskusijas su socialiniais partneriais organizuoti nuolat, pertvarkant programos sandarą. Taip pat galėtų būti įtraukti kiti socialiniai dalininkai, ne tik teatro režisieriai, nes vaidybos profesija yra glaudžiai susijusi su kitomis žiniasklaidos priemonėmis (ypač kinu ir televizija).

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Suteikti geresnes galimybes visuomenei pamatyti naujausius studentų darbus, naudojant tokius mechanizmus kaip universiteto interneto svetainė.
2. Visus programos dėstytojus skatinti strategiškai ir nuosekliai vykdyti mokslinius tyrimus ir publikuoti metodologinius leidinius, įgyvendinant praktines priemones, kurios padėtų personalui rengti publikacijas, stiprinančias institucijos statusą ir padedančias plėtoti programą ateityje.
3. Toliau gerinti išteklių infrastruktūrą, ypač apžiūrėtų dar neatnaujintų darbo patalpų, ir, jei reikia, sudaryti sąlygas savarankiškam darbui.
4. Kurti atviresnę konkurenciją ir įtvirtinti visapusišką dėstytojų priėmimo į programą politiką.
5. Apsvarstyti, ar nereikėtų į studijų turinį, ypač į baigiamąjį darbą, sistemingiau įtraukti istorijos, filosofijos ir mokslinių tyrimų dalykus.
6. Sukurti strategiškesnę tarptautiškumo skatinimo kampaniją ir užtikrinti, kad programa būtų kuo lankstesnė ir studentai galėtų pasinaudoti tarptautinėmis galimybėmis.
7. Aiškiau atskirti studentų išorės praktinį darbą nuo studijų darbo, išlaikant socialinių dalininkų partnerystės ir profesinės praktikos naudą.
8. Užtikrinti, kad vertinimo procesas ir kriterijai būtų atviresni studentams, ir skatinti programoje taikyti kokybinių tyrimų metodus, ypač baigiamajame darbe (kalbant apie pastarąjį – specifikacijas dėl egzaminuojamųjų vaidmenų baigiamajame vaidinime ir rašto darbų vertinimo kriterijų).
9. Apsvarstyti galimybę sukurti daugiau sąsajų su kinu ir televizija ir išplėsti socialinių dalininkų bendruomenę, įtraukiant daugiau kultūros sektoriaus šakų.

<...>

Paslaugos teikėjas patvirtina, jog yra susipažinęs su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)