



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Europos humanitarinio universiteto

**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS VIZUALINIS DIZAINAS IR MEDIJOS
(612W20008)**

VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT

OF VISUAL DESIGN AND MEDIA (612W20008)

STUDY PROGRAMME

at European Humanities University

1. **Mr. John O Connor (team leader), *academic***
2. **Dr. Hanna Karkku, *academic***
3. **Dr. Aija Freimane, *academic***
4. **Ms. Ilona Gurjanova, *academic and representative of social partners'***
5. **Mr. Andrius Ciplijauskas, *representative of social partners'***
6. **Mr. Vytautas Karoblis, *students' representative.***

Evaluation coordinator -

Mr. Pranas Stankus

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Vizualinis dizainas ir medijos
Valstybinis kodas	612W20008
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis	Dizainas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirma
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4), Iššęstinė (5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Dizaino bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	11 of July 2012, Order No. SV6-26

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Visual Design and Media
State code	612W20008
Study area	Arts
Study field	Design
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (4), Part time (5)
Volume of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor's Degree in Design
Date of registration of the study programme	11 of July 2012, Order No. SV6-26

© 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.....	7
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	7
2.2. Curriculum design.....	8
2.3. Teaching staff.....	10
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	11
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment	11
2.6. Programme management	13
2.7. Examples of excellence *	13
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	14
IV. SUMMARY	16
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	18

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	Institutional Review Report of EHU, 2014.
2	System of Evaluation of Academic Achievement of Students of EHU, 2010.

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

Since it was established in Minsk in 1992, the European Humanities University (EHU) has sought to provide Belarusian students with a broad-based humanities (“liberal arts”)

education that promotes creativity, critical thinking, and personal responsibility. It relocated to Vilnius in 2004 following its forced closure in Minsk for political reasons. Registered in 2006 the University is now part of the Lithuanian higher education system and operates in accordance with Lithuanian legislation.

EHU is a non-state university based on European values, where university studies predominate, research is performed and practical studies on art and media, teaching and research in the fields of law, social sciences and humanities are developed for the benefit of the Belarusian society and its relationship to the global community. The university has the rights of a legal entity and acts in the manner prescribed by the laws and regulations of the Republic of Lithuania, the University Statutes and other legislation, incorporating the standards and guidelines of the European Higher Education Area for HEIs. EHU's General Assembly of Part-Owners (GAPO) brings together the organisations responsible for re-establishing EHU in Lithuania after closure of EHU in Minsk. These include the Institute for International Education (Lithuania), the Open Society Foundation (United States), and the Eurasia Foundation (United States).

EHU is located in the capital city of Lithuania—education, research, and student services being concentrated in one building at Valakupiu 5—on a campus belonging to Mykolas Romeris University. The premises of the central administration are located at Tauro 12; Emedia hub, at Konarskio 49-507, Vilnius. The Centre for Language and Pre-University Preparation is located in Minsk, Belarus.

The University consists of four main academic Departments—Media, History, Law, Social and Political Science—and comprises nine Research Centres (EHU Structure). The total student enrolment for 1 October 2014 was 1,352; there are 258 members of the personnel, 154 of them are faculty members of Academic Departments, and 104 are members of the administrative and academic support personnel.

EHU has a strong distance-learning component. More than half of the student body lives in Belarus and visits Vilnius only during exam sessions. Most teachers come from Belarus and visit the EHU campus to provide lectures during the semester. In total, EHU offers eleven interdisciplinary programs at Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral levels with a strong emphasis on social sciences and humanities.

Most courses are taught in the Russian language, with five to ten per cent in Belarusian and about twenty per cent in English, Lithuanian, French and German.

The BA Visual Design and Media program (612W20008) was registered on 18 May 2012, by the Order no. SV6-19-1 of the Director of the Study Quality Assessment Centre. The

programme was developed on the basis of the BA Media and Visual Design program (612W26001), registered on 28 March 2006 (ISAK-583). In order to provide professional competencies in project implementation, the programme offers its students the following two modules: ‘Graphic Design and Layout’ and ‘Multimedia and Animation’. The programme is approved by the Decision no. 30-03 of the Senate of 8 June 2011.

The Review Team received a copy of the Institutional Review Report of EHU from 2014. The Team noted, in particular, concerning paragraph 19 of the report:

“Throughout the review process the Team has been aware that EHU is in a unique position as an institution which was forced to ‘emigrate’ from Belarus after over a decade of efforts to offer an alternative to Soviet-type education, which now operates as a Lithuanian university, and where most students and staff are Belarusian, with a large proportion of both based in Belarus. All this has posed enormous challenges and created tensions as well as practical problems which could not be avoided when moving not only to a country with a different culture and language, but also to a different culture of higher education. The Team also understands that it takes time for an ‘emigrant’ institution to settle into a new environment, in particular since the new environment was originally thought to be only temporarily a host country, and has now become the home country as hopes of returning to Belarus are fading, certainly in the short and medium term.

“Nonetheless, the Team’s role is to judge the University against a specific and explicit set of criteria, established by the SKVC, which are uniformly applicable to all higher education institutions in Lithuania. The criteria are inherently Lithuanian. They also ask primarily for judgement about what is there, rather than what is under development. On both counts EHU is in a difficult position, still being in some fundamental ways a Belarusian university, and also in the process of change following a major review conducted on the initiative of its Governing Board at the beginning of 2013.”

“The Team has sought to follow the SKVC criteria as strictly as possible. It has, however, factored in the ‘unique case’ features of EHU where this has had a bearing on how far the criteria can now be met.”

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 *23 April 2015*.

1. **Mr. John O Connor (team leader)**, *Dublin Institute of Technology, Director and Dean, College of Arts and Tourism, Ireland.*
2. **Dr. Hanna Karkku**, *Aalto University, Planning Officer, Finland.*
3. **Dr. Aija Freimane**, *Art Academy of Latvia, Assistant Professor, Latvia.*
4. **Ms. Ilona Gurjanova**, *Estonian Association of Designers, Chair, Estonia.*
5. **Mr. Andrius Ciplijauskas**, *Beepart Creative Workshop, Director, Lithuania.*
6. **Mr. Vytautas Karoblis**, *Student, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme aims outlined in the Self Evaluation Report (SER) are quite precise, clear and appropriate for the field of study and they are consistent with those of undergraduate design programmes internationally.

The programme learning outcomes are less satisfactory, being less precise and insufficiently comprehensive. They meet the requirements on a basic level but do not adequately address the full design process and they are not as comprehensive as they should be, particularly under the headings of Knowledge and Its Application; and Special Abilities (Subject Specific Skills). While conceptualisation and application are addressed the intermediate process of design development and the iterative process that leads to effective user-centred solutions is not clearly described. A more holistic approach including design thinking, user centred design

Additionally, the programme learning outcomes are not linked specifically to the study subjects/module learning outcomes in accordance with best practice. This appears to be a result of using study subjects/modules that have been developed for other humanities programmes offered by the university without ensuring their relevance to this programme.

The Team recommends (1) that the programme learning outcomes are rewritten to incorporate the full spectrum of the design process and also recommends that they be linked to the subject learning outcomes.

The programme aims and learning outcomes are drafted in accordance with the guidelines of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and take account of the standards set by the professional associations for design, CUMULUS in Europe and the AIGA in the United States. The programme documentation was prepared in accordance with the Law on Higher Education and Research of the Republic of Lithuania. The aims and learning outcomes follow the General Requirements of the First Cycle Degree and Integrated Study Programmes. During the visit the Team confirmed that they are reviewed periodically at Faculty meetings. Social partners are also invited to participate in semester reviews to ensure public needs and the needs of the labour market continue to be met. The aims and learning

outcomes are widely published on the University website, the AIKOS website, social media platforms in addition to print media used for 'Open Door Days' and exhibitions.

The programme title, Visual Design and Media, is broad and suggests a greater level of specialisation choice than is actually the case. Students reported that they were unsure of their specialisation because too many disciplines are covered in the programme. Alumni and social partners also said there was too much emphasis on the basics across all areas and insufficient specialisation. Alumni in particular considered that the programme provided a good basis but did not provide sufficient opportunity for deep learning. The Team recommends (2) that defined specialisation is offered earlier in the programme, for example, students should have the opportunity to opt for graphic design, illustration or animation from late in the first year of study or early in the second year of study. This will give students time to develop greater depth of knowledge and practice in their chosen field and will result in a higher standard of project work.

Overall, while there are some issues with manner in which the learning outcomes are written it seemed to the Team that the programme as delivered is satisfactory and meets international standards. Rewriting the learning outcomes and introducing earlier specialisation, as recommended, will resolve these problems.

2.2. Curriculum design

The Team is satisfied that the university has given consideration to the design of the curriculum based on the premise that the study of humanities teaches students to seek an understanding of what it means to be human and teaches them to think and write. The Team considers this to be an appropriate context within which to set the programme but did not find evidence of this embedded in the project work of students or in their discussion with students. The programme team is recommended (3) to reconsider how to deliver this understanding to students.

It is also noted that the programme seeks to encourage an exploration of identity, particularly in the context of Belarusian culture in a European context, and how it is represented visually in different contexts, for example, from the perspective of the global marketplace or consumer culture. This thinking needs to be connected to the new digital media platforms that are emerging.

The programme complies with the basic requirements for the First Cycle Degree and Integrated Study Programmes. Students must accumulate 240 ECTS over four years of study (or five years if following the part time programme). This is divided into 207 ECTS for courses in the study field and 33 ECTS for 'general university courses focused on subjects of the broad

outlook and erudition'. The content of the subjects is appropriate for the achievement of the learning outcomes and is comparable to similar programmes internationally.

There is a lack of clarity in the SER around the division between core/compulsory subjects and optional/elective subjects. Page 18 of the SER makes reference to 5% of the programme being made up of 'disciplines of free choice' but it is not clear what courses they are and clarity did not emerge during the Team's visit. The Team recommends (4) that the curriculum clearly lists core subjects and distinguishes them from optional/elective subjects.

The Team notes that there have been issues around the evenness and balance of delivery due to work and travel restrictions on staff. Students reported that the schedule changed frequently and that delivery of teaching was neither consistent nor regular. Staff explained that the travel restrictions made it necessary to schedule classes around availability sometimes leading to delivery of subjects in blocks of concentrated time rather than evenly balanced over the semester. However, the Team is satisfied that while these issues may have caused a certain amount of anxiety for students this has not compromised the achievement of the learning outcomes. Furthermore, the Team is pleased to note that the recent stabilisation of staff contracts (see section 2.3 Teaching Staff for further detail) for a five-year period will result in more balanced delivery and recommends (5) that a balanced weekly timetable is developed and issued to students.

Academic staff described the approach to teaching convincingly and with conviction. The methodology is sound. The responses from students supported this view. Each individual module is reasonably well devised and written and themes are specific to study subjects. The content is consistent with bachelor studies internationally except for the lack of reference to the design process (referred to in recommendation 1). This seems to stem from an underlying sense of art practice rather than design. To address this the Team recommends (6) giving consideration to the introduction of subjects such as design thinking, user interaction, and user focused design.

Overall, the scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure that the learning outcomes can be met by students. Indeed, some exemplary projects were presented to the Team. For example, both the Critical Urbanism project and the Gender Issues project are commendable examples of the best practice. These projects brought critical theory to life by situating it in a real context, giving it meaning for the students. This was demonstrated clearly in the student work seen by the Team. The Team commends the encouragement of students to keep a regular diary/sketchbook. This approach supports the development in students of a critical response to what is going on around them. Finally, the typography study leading to the development of new Belarus fonts distinct from traditional Russian Cyrillic deserves mention.

2.3. Teaching staff

The review Team noted that “until recently, most of the academic staff were on short-term contracts, commuting from Belarus to Vilnius; this created enormous problems for staff themselves, and they could hardly be expected to engage fully in their teaching and research activities and, even less so, in any other activities supporting institutional development in one way or another. It is, thus, a big leap on the way from ‘the temporary’ to ‘the normal’ that a core of 57 staff have recently been employed on a full-time basis’. (Institutional Review Report of EHU, 2014, paragraph 62.) Nevertheless, EHU is operating in exile and members of staff are away from their homes and families so the full-time employment contracts will not entirely resolve the instability generated by these circumstances.

It is clear that the issue around staffing has resulted in considerable uncertainty around the delivery of the programme over its lifetime to date. Difficulty with implementing timetables and schedules was presented by both staff and students as a concern. The university must leverage the new employment situation to introduce greater coherence in the delivery of the programme.

The composition of the staff team meets the legal requirements with 1 professor, 7 associate professors, 1 lecturer (Dr), 6 lecturers and 3 assistant lecturers attached to the programme. The staff team is of an appropriate size and appropriately qualified by international standards to deliver on the learning outcomes for the programme. The staff/student ratio for the high-residence mode of study is 1:8 while the ratio for the low-residence mode is 1:15.

Despite the difficulties referred to above the turnover of staff is low and the Team is impressed with the commitment, enthusiasm and on going professional practice of the staff. Individual members are influential artists and designers engaged in book publishing, exhibiting and animated films winning awards on the international stage. One lecturer won the Golden Eagle prize for Best Animated Film of the Year at the National Academy of Motion Pictures and Sciences of Russia and received Best Director at the Open Film Festival of CIT and Baltic States KINOSHOK, Russia in 2012. Another won the National Contest ‘Art of the Book’ for Best Illustrator of the Year in Minsk, Belarus in 2013. The staff team also demonstrate a clear understanding of the remit of EHU and convinced the Team of their ability to deliver on it.

EHU is committed to staff development and has programmes supporting both pedagogical and discipline specific qualifications. Between 2008 and 2011 the university collaborated with the State University of New York on a series of seminars focussed on distance learning methodologies. Staff research leading to PhD qualification is also supported.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The general teaching spaces, classrooms and studios, are adequate for their purpose. While not exemplary, they are appropriate in size and quality. Catering facilities and public areas that can be used as informal learning spaces are also sufficient.

The library, although small, has a good selection of relevant books on both the theoretical and practical subjects. There are not enough study/reading spaces available and it would be worth considering extending and improving this facility.

Workshops and laboratories barely meet the minimum requirements. The Team is concerned that the university does not fully appreciate the importance of such space to design programmes and the necessity of providing appropriate equipment to ensure students can develop practical skills. The photographic studio, for example, has minimal equipment. Computer labs are also quite basic and do not resemble professional facilities in any way. There are no technicians in place to support workshops and laboratories in line with best practice. He is part of IT department.

Staff and students do their best to produce project work despite the lack of facilities and support. But the student experience in this instance is far removed from the international norm and the equivalent professional facilities.

The Team recommends (7) that the university benchmark the resources and facilities supporting the programme and develop an implementation plan (to include the employment of appropriate technician support) to raise the standards over a defined period of time.

Students reported that they were permitted to access the labs and workshops only when a member of staff is present. This does not support independent learning opportunities that are so important for design students. It also limits the time available for them to produce project work. Normally, technician support is used to supervise such access and the Team recommends (8) that appropriate and benchmarked policies and procedures for access to these facilities is developed, implemented and that formal induction training is provided for students.

The university currently meets the minimum requirements for students' practice. Implementation of these recommendations would enhance the arrangements for students.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The course is offered on both a full time and a part time basis. The former (~450) attend on campus in Vilnius full-time while the latter (~650) attend residential sessions and for exams but live in Belarus and receive tuition via the VLE Moodle.

The admission process is not based on the Common Admission system for Lithuanian Higher Education Systems but is conducted by EHU's own procedures. Applicants must have

secondary or vocation secondary education. The Admission Committee holds a preliminary competitive selection based on the analysis of questionnaires and tests to evaluate applicants' aptitude for imaginative thinking and artistic expression. Applicants who pass this stage are invited to attend for interview where the final selection is made. The majority of students are Belarusian with about 5% Lithuanian. The programme is delivered the Russian language mostly with some courses delivered in English to accommodate Erasmus students.

The SER records that two students avail of Erasmus exchange opportunities annually since EHU became eligible in 2010 and, indeed, two students who had spent a semester and a year abroad spoke enthusiastically about the experience. However, they said they were given no opportunity to share their experiences with either staff or peers and, indeed the rest of the students did not see the value of such experience and reported that they receive little encouragement from staff. Students reported that they would like also to avail of the opportunity for shorter study trips abroad.

EHU organises an annual student conference with a specific panel devoted to design. There is an opportunity for students to exhibit their project work. Students' projects have also been successful in international competitions, such as, the international biennale 'Golden Bee' in Moscow (endorsed by ICOGRADA). Not all students appear to be aware of such successes. The course team might consider encouraging the participants to share their experiences with colleagues.

The Team recommends (9) that a strategy to develop international exchanges and field trips should be produced with the support of the university's International office.

Neither the staff nor students were able to describe the approach to assessment in anything but subjective terms. Students were very unsatisfied with the process saying it was comparative and subjective. They added that feedback is not given as a matter of course but only when specifically requested. They also claimed that they were not allowed to appeal their results. After the meetings with staff and students and during the presentation of student project work the 2010 Quality Management System document describing the Evaluation of Academic Achievements of Students became available to the Team. This comprehensive document describes assessment processes, appeals procedures and objective criteria for assessment. The Team recommends (10) that training be provided for staff in this area and that students are made aware of this document.

The Team was impressed with the calibre of the graduates met during the visit. A number of them had decided to remain in Lithuania. Some found employment in the design sector and

some established their own businesses. All were satisfied that the programme had given them the ability to succeed.

2.6. Programme management

The programme is managed by the Head of Department of Media and the Programme Curator with the support of the Departmental Committee. The university has a comprehensive internal Quality Management System under which the programme is monitored and evaluated on an annual basis. An anonymous student survey is carried out each semester using the VLE Moodle. The results of the survey are analysed by management to form the basis of discussion with academic staff leading to improvement and development of the programme.

Social partners are invited to engage in the review of the programme on an annual basis. They are also invited to join the final Bachelor's project assessment team.

However, the Team noticed the hierarchical nature of EHU and, while understanding how it has evolved from the soviet system and the uncertainty around the exile from Belarus, believe that it is now restricting the development of the programme. Communication between senior administrative staff and teaching staff should be improved. The same applies to communication between staff and students. The students did not seem comfortable discussing shortcomings in the programme and the Team identified that the culture of reflection and critique does not extend sufficiently to incorporate the student voice. The programme aims to encourage students to reflect critically on the world but is less successful in allowing them to apply the same process to their own immediate environment in the university and their study experience. The Team recommends (11) that the university engage more formally with the Students' Union (a member of the Lithuanian Students' Union) to improve communication and provide a mechanism for responding to student concerns.

The documentation, university website and meetings with staff, social partners and alumni convinced the Team that EHU takes quality assurance very seriously and has an effective mechanism to ensure on-going improvement of the programme.

2.7. Examples of excellence *

* if there are any to be shared as a good practice

1. The Team saw evidence of excellent creative skills at the core of the programme and this is a positive reflection on teaching staff.
2. Both the Critical Urbanism project and the Gender Issues project are commendable examples of the best practice.
3. The diary approach to drawing is successful in developing a creative thinking approach in students and is to be commended.

4. The typography study leading to the development of new Belarus fonts distinct from traditional Russian Cyrillic deserves mention.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The programme learning outcomes should be rewritten to incorporate the full spectrum of the design process. Also, they should be aligned with the subject learning outcomes.
2. The option to specialise should be offered earlier in the programme, for example, students should have the opportunity to opt for graphic design, illustration or animation from late in the first year of study or early in the second year of study. This would give students time to develop greater depth of knowledge and practice in their chosen field and should result in a higher standard of project work.
3. The premise that an understanding of humanities subjects provides an appropriate context for the study of design is welcome but the Team did not find evidence of this embedded in the project work of students or in their discussion with students. The programme team should reconsider how to deliver this understanding to students.
4. The curriculum should list core subjects and should distinguish clearly between core and optional/elective subjects.
5. A balanced weekly timetable should be developed and issued to students.
6. To address the underlying sense of art practice rather than design practice in the programme consideration should be given to introducing subjects such as design thinking, user interaction, user focused design.
7. The university should benchmark the workshop and laboratory resources and facilities supporting the programme; an implementation plan (including the employment of appropriate technician support) should be developed with the aim of raising the standards over a defined period of time.
8. Appropriate and benchmarked policies and procedures describing student access to workshop and laboratory facilities should be developed and implemented. Formal induction training needs to be provided for students.
9. A strategy for international exchanges and field trips should be developed with the support of the university's International office.
10. Training should be provided for staff in in the context of the 2010 Quality Management System document describing the Evaluation of Academic Achievements of Students and students should be made aware of this document.

11. The university should engage more formally with the Students' Union (a member of the Lithuanian Students' Union) to improve communication and provide a mechanism for responding to student concerns.

IV. SUMMARY

Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme aims are satisfactory but the learning outcomes do not adequately address the full design process. They also need to be better aligned with the study subjects learning outcomes. Specialisation should be introduced to the programme at an earlier stage.

Curriculum design

The premise that the study of humanities teaches students to seek an understanding of what it means to be human and teaches them to think and write is positive but it does not appear to be embedded in the students' work.

The exploration of Belarusian culture needs to be connected to the new digital media platforms that are emerging.

Clarity needs to be given on what subjects are core and what are optional. A balanced weekly timetable should be developed. New subjects exploring design thinking, user interaction and user focused design should be introduced.

Teaching staff

Staff conditions have been difficult with teachers commuting from Belarus and operating on temporary contracts. The introduction this year of some more stability should improve the situation for staff who are to be commended for their commitment, enthusiasm and ongoing professional practice.

Facilities and learning resources

General teaching spaces are adequate and the library has a good selection of books. Workshops and laboratories barely meet the minimum requirements. The university must carry out a benchmarking exercise leading to the development of an implementation plan to upgrade these facilities and provide technical support to staff and students.

Study process and students' performance assessment

International opportunities are not supported as fully as they could be. Students should be informed about Erasmus options and encouraged to avail of them. The annual student conference is a positive aspect of the programme.

Assessment appears to be somewhat subjective and students are not satisfied with this, nor are they satisfied with feedback on their work. There is a comprehensive quality guideline book produced by the university but teachers need training and students need to be informed of it.

Programme management

A student survey is carried out using VLE Moodle each year. Communication between senior administrative staff and teaching staff should be improved. The same applies to communication between staff and students. The programme aims to encourage students to reflect critically on the world but is less successful in allowing them to apply the same process to their own immediate environment in the university and their study experience.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Visual Design and Media* (state code – 612W20008) at European Humanities University is given a **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	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	2
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	2
	Total:	13

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Mr. John O Connor
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Dr. Hanna Karkku
	Dr. Aija Freimane
	Ms. Ilona Gurjanova
	Mr. Andrius Ciplijauskas
	Mr. Vytautas Karoblis

Vertimas iš anglų kalbos

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Reikėtų perrašyti programos studijų rezultatus ir apimti visus dizaino proceso aspektus. Programos studijų rezultatus taip pat reikėtų susieti su dalykų studijų rezultatais.
2. Galimybė rinktis specializaciją turėtų būti siūloma pirmoje studijų programos dalyje, pavyzdžiui, studentai turėtų turėti galimybę rinktis grafinį dizainą, iliustraciją ar animaciją pirmo kurso pabaigoje arba antro kurso pradžioje. Tuomet studentai turėtų daugiau laiko gilinti pasirinktos srities teorines bei praktines žinias ir galėtų parengti aukštesnio lygio projektus.
3. Prielaida, kad humanitarinių dalykų supratimas suteikia tinkamą kontekstą dizaino studijoms, yra sveikintina, tačiau ekspertų grupė nerado įrodymų nei studentų projektuose, nei diskutuodama su studentais. Programos vykdytojai turėtų persvarstyti, kaip šį supratimą perteikti studentams.
4. Programoje turėtų būti išvardyti pagrindiniai studijų dalykai ir aiškiai atskirti pagrindiniai ir pasirenkamieji dalykai.
5. Reikėtų parengti ir studentams pateikti subalansuotą savaitinį tvarkaraštį.
6. Siekiant išspręsti problemą, kad programoje labiau akcentuojama meno, o ne dizaino praktika, reikėtų apsvarstyti naujų dalykų – dizainerio mąstymas, vartotojų sąveika ir į vartotoją orientuotas dizainas – įtraukimą į programą.
7. Universitetas turėtų atlikti programos dirbtuvių ir laboratorijų materialiujų išteklių kokybės palyginimą ir pagal jį parengti įgyvendinimo planą (taip pat įtraukti punktą apie atitinkamų techninių darbuotojų įdarbinimą), kad būtų galima pagerinti kokybę per nustatytą laikotarpį.
8. Reikėtų parengti ir įgyvendinti tinkamą ir palyginamą politiką ir procedūrų aprašus, kuriuose būtų aprašytos studentų galimybės naudotis dirbtuvėmis ir laboratorijomis. Studentus reikėtų oficialiai supažindinti su šių išteklių naudojimo taisyklėmis.
9. Padedant universiteto Tarptautinių ryšių skyriui, reikėtų parengti tarptautinių mainų ir ekskursijų strategiją.
10. Personalas turėtų išmokti taikyti 2010 m. kokybės vadybos sistemos dokumentą, kuriame aprašomas studentų akademinų pasiekimų vertinimas; studentus taip pat reikėtų supažindinti su šiuo dokumentu.

11. Universitetas turėtų oficialiau bendradarbiauti su Studentų sąjunga (Lietuvos studentų sąjungos nare), siekdamas pagerinti bendravimą ir sukurti mechanizmą, kaip spręsti studentams rūpimus klausimus.

IV. SANTRAUKA

Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai

Programos tikslai suformuluoti pakankamai gerai, tačiau studijų rezultatai nepakankamai apima visus dizaino proceso aspektus. Programos studijų rezultatus taip pat reikėtų geriau susieti su dalykų studijų rezultatais. Specializacijos turėtų būti siūlomos pirmoje programos dalyje.

Programos sandara

Prielaida, kad humanitarinių dalykų studijos moko studentus suprasti, ką reiškia būti žmogumi, taip pat – mąstyti ir rašyti, yra sveikintina, tačiau tai neatsispindi studentų darbuose.

Baltarusijos kultūros studijas reikėtų susieti su naujomis skaitmeninių medijų platformomis.

Turėtų būti aiškiau išskirti studijų pagrindiniai ir pasirenkamieji dalykai. Reikėtų parengti subalansuotą savaitinį tvarkaraštį. Taip pat reikėtų įtraukti naujus dalykus – dizainerio mąstymas, vartotojų sąveika ir į vartotoją orientuotas dizainas.

Personalas

Personalo situacija sudėtinga, nes dėstytojai važinėja iš Baltarusijos ir dirba pagal laikinas darbo sutartis. Didesnio stabilumo užtikrinimas šiais metais turėtų pagerinti šią situaciją, o dėstytojus derėtų pagirti už atsidavimą, entuziazmą ir nuolatinę profesinę veiklą.

Materialieji ištekliai

Bendrosios mokymo erdvės tinkamos, bibliotekoje užtikrinamas platus knygų pasirinkimas. Dirbtuvės ir laboratorijos vargiai atitinka minimalius reikalavimus. Universitetas privalo atlikti kokybės palyginimą ir pagal jį parengti materialiujų išteklių atnaujinimo ir techninės pagalbos personalui ir studentams teikimo planą.

Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

Tarptautinės galimybės remiamos nepakankamai. Studentai turėtų būti informuojami apie „Erasmus“ programos galimybes ir skatinami jomis naudotis. Teigiamas programos aspektas yra kasmetė studentų konferencija.

Studentai nepatenkinti vertinimo subjektyvumu ir grįžtamuoju ryšiu apie savo darbus. Universitetas yra parengęs išsamias kokybės gaires, tačiau dėstytojams reikėtų išmokti jas taikyti, o studentams – su jomis susipažinti.

Programos vadyba

Kasmet virtualiojoje mokymosi aplinkoje *Moodle* vykdoma studentų apklausa. Reikėtų pagerinti viršesnių administracijos darbuotojų ir dėstytojų bendravimą, taip pat dėstytojų ir studentų tarpusavio bendravimą. Vienas iš programos siekių – skatinti studentus kritiškai reflektuoti pasaulį, tačiau nesuteikiamos galimybės tai daryti jų artimiausioje aplinkoje universitete ir studijuojant.