



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus universiteto  
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS SEMIOTIKA (valstybinis kodas -  
621T92001)  
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT  
OF SEMIOTICS (state code -621T92001)  
STUDY PROGRAMME  
at Vilnius University**

**Experts' team:**

1. Dr. Viktors Freibergs (team leader) academic,
2. Dr. Sara Lenninger, academic,
3. Dr. Elin Sutiste, academic,
4. Ms. Julija Paulauskaitė, students' representative.

**Evaluation coordinator -**

*Ms. Dovilė Žeimienė*

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language – English

Vilnius  
2017

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Semiotika</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621T92001
Studijų sritis	Humanitariniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Filologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinė studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Semiotikos magistras
Studijų programos įregistruavimo data	2005

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Semiotics</i>
State code	621T92001
Study area	Humanities
Study field	Philology
Type of the study programme	University Studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Semiotics
Date of registration of the study programme	2005

## CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1.    Background of the evaluation process.....	4
1.2.    Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information.....	4
1.3    The Review Team.....	4
<b>II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2.2. Curriculum design .....	6
2.3. Teaching staff .....	7
2.4. Facilities and learning resources .....	8
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	9
2.6. Programme management .....	11
2.7. Examples of excellence .....	12
<b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## 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. *Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information*

The MA programme “Semiotics” is one of the programmes offered by the Faculty of Philology at Vilnius University which is the oldest university in the Baltic States. It must be noted that the programme under evaluation excels by its uniqueness from the perspective of the courses offered within it. The programme was launched in 2005.

### 1.3. *The Review Team*

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. V-41 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *16 May, 2017*.

1. **Prof. Viktors Freibergs (team leader), Head of Communication Studies Department, University of Latvia, Latvia;**
  2. **Dr. Sara Lenninger, lecturer and researcher in Educational Science, Kristianstad University, Sweden;**
  3. **Dr. Elin Sutiste, Associate Professor at Institute of Philosophy and Semiotics, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Tartu, Estonia;**
  4. **Ms. Julija Paulauskaitė, graduate of Kaunas University of Technology study programme Media Philosophy.**
- Evaluation coordinator – Ms. Dovilė Žeimienė.**

## **II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS**

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

Programme objective(s) and intended learning outcomes are well-defined, clear and publicly announced. It is stated that the aim of the programme is “to train qualified discourse analysts”, however it may be a little misleading since it may be understood as if the focus were on educating the students especially in the (not necessarily semiotic or Greimasian) more narrow field of discourse analysis—while it is more probably meant that the aim is to teach students to be able to semiotically analyse all kinds of social and cultural discourses.

During the meeting with staff, the two main aims of the programme were stated with great clarity: (1) providing students with semiotic instruments of analysis [that they can apply in analysing all kinds of texts and discourses], (2) developing the critical mind so that the students receive a wider educational framework [in which they are competent to carry out their analyses]. Perhaps these aims could be incorporated into the description of the aims of the programme retaining the existent name of the programme which is sufficiently broad in order to permit some structural changes within it, if there should be such a need in future.

Programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the state, societal and labour market needs. Based on the transdisciplinary nature of semiotics this master programme contributes to society with experts capable of carrying out highly qualified and critical analyses in different societal research areas. The specific competence to systematically handle meaning constructions and their outcomes in, and across, various cultural contexts provide a substantial contribution to societal needs that is unique for the semiotics learned at the master programme in semiotics at VU.

Programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission, operational objectives and strategy of Vilnius University.

Programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked on academic requirements. The programme is strongly connected with the academic work and research that is carried out by the teachers, apart from that it also provides an indispensable opportunity for the students to attend to the summer school and Baltic conferences. The connection to professional practice is very much brought in to the programme by the students themselves. This is a circumstance that is provided for by the teachers’ competence to implement the semiotic perspective in various fields. Moreover, the teachers’ willingness to support and develop every student’s critical semiotic perspective in their chosen field of interest is made clear from the interviews and after examining the diversity of themes of the MA thesis.

Programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the type and cycle of studies and the level of qualifications. The emphasis on methodology (i.e. developing the analytical competence) and advanced academic interdisciplinary perspectives in the learning outcomes correspond well to the level of education and to the overall aims of the programme.

In the self-evaluation report (S-E-R.) it has been also noted that in the ongoing improvements of the master programme, efforts are made to update the study courses in order to correspond to the changing landscape of education in the world (although not mentioning what changes are the most urgent here). The visits of, and collaboration with internationally influential scholars in semiotics (cf. Manar Hammad and Per Age Brant, and scholars from Limoge) indicates that the programme has received high international attention and interest on how the semiotics develops in Lithuania. Moreover, the other way round is also clear; the interest from the point of view of

the programme to develop within an international perspective is strengthened by inviting of guest lecturers and researchers from different parts of the world (Europe, South America and USA).

The programme description should better reflect the actual focus on Greimasian semiotics. The programme could also put more effort in providing the students with skills of analysing political and legal discourses (in addition to the prevalent literary and artistic discourses) that are described in the learning outcomes of the programme but are not that are not so prominently present in the programme contents.

## ***2.2. Curriculum design***

The programme structure is in line with the General Requirements of Master Degree Study Programmes (Order No V-826 of 3 June 2010) as well as with the Descriptor of Study Cycles (Order No V-2212 of 21 November 2011), both approved by the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania. The programme structure meets all the standards established by the General Requirements, including the duration and volume of the study programme, level of study programme, number of subjects taught in one semester, independent work of students, and the preparation of the final thesis as well as the qualification of teaching staff.

In students' opinion the sequence of the subjects should be revised. The reasoning behind the statement is that during second semester they only analyse theory of semiotics, they wish to have more practice assignments. Teachers stressed that the manner in which study modules are taught is crucial to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Based on the facts that the programme has a profile in semiotics, and no bachelor's programme in Lithuania offers courses in semiotics, there is no overlapping (or the risk for overlapping is very low) with first circle courses.

The teachers as well as students confirmed that there is no overlapping between different subjects and that the programme structure has been devised thoroughly and with full attention to the logic and consistency of subjects. At the same time, on the level of subject titles and descriptions there appear some strong similarities between the subjects as several of them focus on the (different aspects of) Greimasian semiotics. Therefore it might be advisable to revise the titles and descriptions of the subjects so as to more precisely foreground the actual differences between subjects and their complementarity. For example, the course entitled "Methodology" is mainly based on ideas and works by Paul Ricoeur, perhaps it would be worthwhile to reflect the contents of the course more specifically in its title.

The content of subjects corresponds to the type and cycle of studies. Although the study programme is called "Semiotics" and various semiotic theories are taught, Greimas theory of semiotics is the core of study programme. For this reason study programme would become more transparent if some changes were made to make it clearer for potential students that the study programme concentrates on Greimas theory of semiotics. This could be done by revising name or description of the study programme, or introducing more introductory courses in the beginning of studies. It would also help to have a broader approach to semiotics and get to know more recent science researches.

Content of subjects (modules) and study methods like analysing political and advertisement texts, museum exhibitions, participating in interdisciplinary courses, seminars enable students to achieve intended learning outcomes.

As to the study methods, it seems the focus at present is on the traditional format of lectures and seminars, together with oral reports made by students. In addition, it could be suggested that also

some other forms of active learning (e.g., group work, portfolios, project study, case study, more practical applications) could be employed. As a positive example, a visit to a museum followed by a theoretical discussion was pointed out by both students and teachers, but it seemed more an isolated example than a frequent procedure.

More contact with more social partners could be developed and integrated also into the study programme so that students would get a better idea how the semiotic theories can be applied in real-life situations. The alumni of the programme stressed that there could be more connections to the market (with applications of theoretical knowledge to practice as well as internships such as work for advertising companies etc.).

The scope of the programme could be better reflected in course descriptions. Nevertheless the themes of the final thesis vary from theoretical analysis of films music tracks to vanishing graveyards.

The programme seems best to achieve the learning outcomes with regard to literary and art texts, however on the basis of course descriptions as well as the meeting with students there is less evidence of the treatment of political, commercial and media discourse. For instance, it was mentioned that writings on legal semiotics are accessible mostly in French and most students are not fluent enough in French; also with regard to political discourse only an analysis of political discourse was read, but the theory was not applied to analysing any actual political discourse, e.g. a political campaign.

There is evidence of the use of the latest academic achievements (foremost Lithuanian scholars' work), while the main emphasis is on the classic texts. There is little information on the material analysed in the subjects; most information given refers also to classical material (e.g. Maupassant, Degas). There is not much evidence with regard to the analysis of the latest technological achievements.

### **2.3. Teaching staff**

The study programme is provided by the staff that in general meets the legal requirements as reflected in the General Requirements of Master Degree Study Programmes (Order No V-826 of 3 June 2010, approved by the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania), which states, in §19, that “No less than 80% [...] of the teaching staff shall have advanced degrees [...] of which no less than 60% [...] shall engage in research in the same area as the subject they teach. [...] No less than 20% of the subjects in the main field of studies shall be taught by full professors”.

With regard to the evaluated study programme, of the 15 persons involved in teaching the subjects of the programme, 13 (nearly 90%, i.e. more than the required 80%) have a doctoral degree (in addition, E. Landowski who has no formal degree but great experience as a researcher teaches “Sociosemiotics” and a PhD candidate Jevsejevas has been involved in teaching “Semiotic Text Analysis”).

It is also safe to say that the majority of the teachers engage in research in the same area as the subjects they teach.

As to the subjects taught by full professors, Prof. Sverdiolas teaches two compulsory subjects, “Hermeneutic Theory of Culture” and “Methodology of Humanities”. In addition he leads the semi-informal “Interdisciplinary Seminar” (which is also partly included in the programme under the name “Research Seminar” and as such is compulsory for the MA students in their 3rd semester; under this name, the seminar appears to be conducted by PhD Katkuviene). Prof.

Nastopka has taught the compulsory subject “Semiotics of Culture”, which lately seems to have been taken over by Assoc. Professor Macianskaite. So at present it appears that full professors teach at least 2 courses and possibly to some extent also other 2 courses. The 20% of the programme required to be taught by full professors would be 4 courses (out of 20 offered in the semiotics programme) and this goal is (almost) met.

The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes. All teaching staff members are specialists in their fields and active in university and country cultural events, there is a summer school in semiotics organized annually, it is an international event and seems to get haj publicity in the academic circles.

Although the number of the teaching staff is adequate, bigger number of staff would make staff turnover more easy. Teachers also expressed opinion that younger staff members would help to bring new ideas in study programme development and help to make studies more appealing for potential students.

The meeting with the staff left a strong impression that since most teachers work on several positions and are not involved only in the semiotics programme, which increases their workload yet from the discussions with the staff members it seems obvious that they perceive their teaching in MA Semiotics programme as a priority. Yet the big work load exerts large pressure on individual staff members.

Talking about teaching staff turnover, all traveling is usually organized individually. And even though teachers' can participate in exchange programs, the workload is so heavy that it is rather difficult and on some occasions impossible to find substitute teacher for their courses.

It should be stressed that the teaching staff of the programme is very efficient and active in finding resources in order to organize international events in Lithuania and to participate in conferences organized in other countries. Besides, the teaching staff is very actively publishing research papers thus most of the professors and teachers are well-known academics abroad. It is obvious from the discussions with the faculty that they use all the above mentioned activities as a platform for professional upgrading.

#### ***2.4. Facilities and learning resources***

Most premises for students are adequate. Nevertheless students stressed that there is one basement auditorium (it should be noted that it is very-well equipped) that during the winters is too cold which can be obviously solved and is a purely a technical issue.

Since the building of the University is very old and it cannot be reconstructed (apart from a HEI it is an important architectural monument) there are not enough premises for the teachers to work in between the classes and places where to consult the students. The problem is solved by a possibility to reserve a working space in the main library of Vilnius University (VU) or by using premises of A.J. Greimas Centre for Semiotics and Literary Theory.

The problem can be also alleviated by the University administration providing the teaching staff with additional laptop computers.

So far there have been no requirements that students should undergo actual practice during their master's studies; therefore there is also no evidence for adequate arrangements for students' practice. On the other hand, students are involved in annual summer schools and participate also in (partly informal) interdisciplinary seminars which provide them with a view of practical application of theories learned. In other words, practice so far seems to be oriented mostly

towards application within academic environment, but not outside academia. Considering the low status of academic scholarship (due to the low pay and great workload) pointed out both by students as well as the teaching staff, it may be advisable to consider more practice opportunities for students outside the university settings (this was advised also by the alumni of the programme).

As for the teaching materials, students of the programme are free to use the materials available at the VU Central library and its reading rooms, besides A.J. Greimas Centre for Semiotics and Literary Theory has a very good selection of academic books that students can borrow for a certain time and read at home.

The students have access to scientific periodicals in the area of semiotics, such as, the journal *Actes sémiotiques* published in French and *Semiotika*, the journal published by A.J. Greimas Centre for Semiotics and Literary Theory, which as the review panel understands, are published in Open Access and thus easily available for students. Students also have full access to the electronic resources and databases subscribed by the VU Library. The staff has also a possibility of ordering books to supplement the library with the latest research in semiotics or classical studies that are required for the studies at MA Semiotics programme. According to the information provided in the self-evaluation report, in 2017, there are plans to increase the VU Library resources with translations of A.J. Greimas' works into English for the benefit of those students whose English is better than French.

A group of the programme staff members have also created a valuable open access online study source: an explanatory Lithuanian dictionary of literary and semiotic terms called “Avant-texte” (<http://www.avantekstas.flf.vu.lt>) which is used not only by the teachers and the MA Semiotics programme students but also by teachers and students from other programmes of Vilnius University, and even by teachers and students from other higher learning institutions in Lithuania.

## **2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment**

Entrance requirements are well-founded, consistent and transparent. Students from all study fields are welcome which makes this study programme unique. All staff members (from administration and teaching staff) as well as students expressed opinions that it is the strength of the given study programme. The reasoning behind these statements was that every student educational background enriches experience during studies. “Semiotics” is also the only one study programme in semiotics in whole country.

In self-evaluation report (SER) heavy work load and work was mentioned as one of the reasons behind high dropout numbers among students. Although the students expressed opinion that the biggest problem is managing the heavy workload during the studies their and their working-hours at their job places, is the schedule of lectures. Lectures planned by the decisions of the department, but usually lectures are held during the day. It was mentioned that lectures are not obligatory, only seminars are compulsory.

Consistent lecture hours, throughout the years would help students to manage work and studies. For example have lectures only in the morning or only in the evenings but not during the day. Senior management group assured that it could be possible to arrange.

It should be mentioned that all of the students agree with heavy workload as they understand it is master's studies and they are happy with the choices they made.

Students are encouraged to take part in various seminars, summers school (academic week in Druskininkai). All initiatives from students are welcomed as well. Nevertheless some students would like to see more offers from university for internships and practice outside the VU.

There are possibilities to participate in exchange programs like Erasmus+. Information about it is accessible in the university webpage. Most students use this opportunity during their bachelor studies. Only one student was planning to go to internship during master studies. Hence students' mobility is low and should be improved and encouraged more.

VU offers academic and social support. Students feel like they can talk to their teachers and administration staff. Atmosphere in community of VU seems very warm and welcoming. Alumni expressed the same thoughts. But it should be mentioned that most consultations are held informally and tutors / supervisors are introduced only in 3<sup>rd</sup> semester. Staff members said it is hard to introduce tutors / supervisors sooner because only in the end of first year students are acquainted with all semiotic methods and teachers. It is very hard to introduce them (students) with semiotics in the start, it could be solved by offering introductory courses during the first semester.

It is difficult to decide how much social support to students is ensured by the university. The review team did not meet anyone with, for example, physical disabilities who would have expressed their opinions on the support with studies.

Since the majority of the MA students also work, it is clear that the possible grants or scholarships to be received e.g. on account of good study results must be few or insignificant and therefore students are forced to combine studies with earning their living in order to sustain themselves.

Requirements for course work, bachelor and master final thesis are all in one document. Guidelines for final thesis should be clearer; content of master thesis should be more specified. The review team also missed the guidelines for modules assessments.

Professional activities of the majority of programme graduates correspond to the expectations of programme. Advertising is common field for students to work after graduating. Teachers think it is mainly because it is *applicable* and it is a field with a lack of professionals who understand our culture.

Study programme is very interdisciplinary, it focuses not only on semiotics but also hermeneutics, phenomenology, various cultural phenomena, visualizations and etc. although concrete examples were not given. Hence the country's social needs could be better reflected and identified in cooperation with social partners during the study years.

It appears that the library facilities and the stock of books are excellent except that there are certain limitations of the working space which is due to the fact that the university is in an old building, and it is impossible to build in the campus additional premises as mentioned in point 2.4.

The students' MA thesis, and the panel understands also other reports or written assignments in the courses delivered in MA Semiotics programme, are checked for plagiarism, the students are also provided with the feedback about the grades that they receive. And no less importantly, they are provided with the requirements in each of the programme courses, which ensure avoiding claims for unfair or unclear grading.

Judging by the MA thesis abstracts, the difference of their length, recommendation is to define more specifically what the abstract must contain. Since all the MA theses are in Lithuanian other recommendations are impossible to provide, but given the diversity of themes of the thesis, the team tends to believe that some of them might create a wider interest in English speaking community, thus the particular emphasis on the abstracts.

The review group were left with an impression that there are certain formal opportunities to make complaints and appeals; however it did not become quite clear how public or transparent these procedures are.

## **2.6. Programme management**

Faculty is now going under some reorganization, so responsibilities of staff members can change. From the SER as well as from the meeting it appeared that the programme committee does intensive work in order to improve and monitor the programme. On the other hand, the allocation of different responsibilities of the committee is not very clear: what is whose responsibility etc. Also it appeared during the meetings that the extra work that the staff members put in programme monitoring and improvement is not reimbursed or taken into account when considering their teaching responsibilities (e.g. their teaching load is not diminished when they do additional administrative work).

Main feedback is gathered through academic system in the end of each semester. It is made compulsory by not allowing students to sign up for next semester course if the survey is not filled out. That leads to inefficient feedback gathering as was mentioned in SER. It is a problem of whole university. Additional feedback is gathered by Greimas centre. Although students said that they only filled such survey once, and it was for the purposes of SER.

Other feedback is gathered only in informal manner, by discussing it in person after lectures. While the atmosphere is good for such communication, it should be more systematic/structuralized as none of the students could remember an example where changes were made according to their feedback.

It appears there have been no previous external evaluation of the programme but after discussion with the teaching staff it became clear that internal evaluation has been done on regular basis.

Study programme committee is responsible for the attraction of social partners. It is not usual practice in Lithuania for senior administration staff to manage social partners and other similar things in study programmes. Study programme has one official social partner. There are other academic partners and some unofficial relations. To ensure further consistent development, more official social partners from Lithuania and abroad should be found. Students also agreed that it would be useful to have more connections with markets in Lithuania, as well as internships.

Internal quality assurance measures based on feedback seem to include so far the not-so-effective academic feedback system in VUSIS and the informal feedback given by students to teachers, the effectiveness of which is not clear either. It appears that the main measures to assure the quality are in fact the staff's own thorough discussions on the programme structure and contents and their correspondence to formal requirements.

Information about all the programmes is represented in faculty webpage and Facebook page, although senior management group wishes that Greimas centre would be more active advertising their programme. Most students are attracted from direct encounter from open seminars, and the summer school. Part of SER group also thinks that there is no marketing strategy, it is only done verbally. It might be possible to introduce an introductory course in Semiotics which might also

serve as a certain marketing tool for the MA programme. Some courses on Greimasian semiotics in English – which should also be widely publicized both in Lithuania, including on the web pages of the university, the faculty and the centre as well as abroad – would definitely have a positive effect on advertising the programme and would make it lucrative also for foreign (e.g. Erasmus) students and teachers.

### ***2.7. Examples of excellence***

Teachers' expertise, dedication and hard work as well as the students' overall enthusiasm is certainly something that stands out as excellent and should be highly praised and taken care of so that it could flourish further.

### **III. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Study programme should offer more courses and literature in English to facilitate interest of researchers and students from other countries, since the programme indeed is unique by its contents.
2. More flexible lectures hours could be considered.
3. Consideration might be given for reorganizing the content in the course “Metatheory of language”. One of possible solutions is to divide it into two separate courses. The course contains important supplements in semiotic theory but also in themes (such as gender theory). Additionally, the course provides (a résumé of) philosophical questions on meaning and reality.
4. Finding more social partners could establish a stronger link between the MA programme and the social needs of the country.
5. Appointment for the students of tutors / supervisors of their MA thesis could help the students make more focused choices from the optional courses.

### **IV. SUMMARY**

The programme objectives, as well as its learning outcomes and aims are stated with great clarity. It follows from the above that the main two tasks of the programme are: 1) to provide students with semiotic instruments of analysis that can be applied analysing diverse texts and discourses; 2) to develop critical thinking skills in students and the programme provides sufficiently wide framework to achieve this goal. The self-evaluation report mentions that the programme is constantly upgraded to correspond to the changing academic landscape in the world, the expected changes could be more specifically formulated, although the members of the evaluation team are also aware (after meeting the Faculty administration) that the entire Faculty of Philology is to undergo certain changes which at the present moment apparently makes it more difficult to define the intended Semiotics programme changes.

There is no semiotics module at the first circle education in the BA programme which ensures there is no overlapping of the courses with any other programmes. On the other hand, it could make the first semester very hard for students, which is alleviated by the on-line explanatory semiotic terms dictionary designed by the MA Semiotics staff. The contents of the subjects indicates that methods, e.g., of analysing advertisement texts, museum exhibitions, participating in interdisciplinary courses and seminars enable the students to achieve the learning outcomes. Perhaps the forms of teaching could be slightly diversified (group work, portfolios, case studies, practical applications).

It is safe to say the majority of the teaching staff engage in research in the same areas as the subjects they teach. Professor Sverdiolas leads the semi-informal “Interdisciplinary Seminar” which is included in the programme under the name of “Research Seminar”. The evaluation team considers that this is a valuable input in “advertising” the Semiotics MA programme and one of the tools or platforms for regular upgrading of the programme staff and the programme contents.

Although the number of the staff members is adequate, a larger number of staff members could increase the mobility possibilities for the staff members but the members of the evaluation team are also aware that this is connected with possible financial constraints at Vilnius University.

The students have full access to all the VU library resources including the data bases subscribed by the library. Besides, there is an impressive collection of academic literature at Greimas Centre for Semiotics and Literary Theory. According to the self-evaluation report, there are plans to translate some of Greimas work into English for the benefit of those students who are not very fluent in French. There is no requirement that the students must undergo practice during the study in order to get “hands-on” experience how their academic knowledge can be used to solve practical tasks. Yet, on the other hand, the students participate in the annual Summer Schools which is a valuable experience gained outside the classroom.

It was obvious from the discussions with the teaching staff, students and alumni that the lecturers are very forthcoming and ready to provide assistance to the students who might face certain difficulties in some of the subjects. The students must combine their working life with the studies, perhaps a solution for decreasing dropout rates could be re-scheduling the lecture times.

It has been repeatedly stressed in the present report that the main advantage of the MA programme in Semiotics is its uniqueness, the high professionalism of the teaching staff, their unusual enthusiasm and also very strong support given to students whose evaluation of the programme is exceptionally positive. The teaching staff is very dedicated and motivated that is a quality no less significant than the research and academic skills. The programme should be more widely advertised, and its marketing strategy worked out. By introducing courses in English, greater mobility (which is to be dealt with on the level of Faculty and University administration) would also contribute to wider international interest in it (which already exists since prominent guest lecturers are invited on regular basis).

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme Semiotics (state code – 621T92001) at Vilnius 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	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>18</b>

\*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:	Dr. Viktors Freibergs
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Dr. Sara Lenninger
	Dr. Elin Sutiste
	Ms. Julija Paulauskaitė

**VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS  
SEMIOTIKA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 6211NX020, 621T92001)  
2017-06-27 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-140 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Vilniaus universiteto studijų programa *Semiotika* (valstybinis kodas – 6211NX020, 621T92001) 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	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	<b>Iš viso:</b>	<b>18</b>

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

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

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

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

**IV. SANTRAUKA**

Programos tikslai, mokymosi rezultatai ir siekiniai yra labai aiškiai įvardyti. Pagrindinės dvi programos užduotys: 1) suteikti studentams semiotinius analizės įrankius, kuriuos galima būtų panaudoti įvairių tekštų ir diskursų analizei; 2) ugdyti studentų kritinio mąstymo įgūdžius; programos struktūra yra pakankamai plati šiam tikslui pasiekti. Savianalizės suvestinėje minima, jog programa pastoviai atnaujinama, kad atspindėtų pokyčius pasaulyje akademinėje erdvėje. Šie numanomi pokyčiai galėtų būti tiksliau suformuluoti, nors vertinimo komisijos nariai taip pat supranta (po susitikimo su fakulteto administracija), kad visame Filologijos fakultete įvyks pokyčiai, šiuo metu galimai apsunkinantys numatomų Semiotikos programos pokyčių apibrėžimą.

Pirmos pakopos (bakalauro) programe nėra semiotikos modulio. Tai užtikrina, kad Semiotikos programos ir kitų programų kursai nesidubliuotų. Kita vertus, dėl šios priežasties studentams pirmasis semestras gali būti labai sunkus. Jį palengvina internetinis aiškinamasis semiotikos terminų žodynas, sukurtas Semiotikos magistro programos darbuotojų. Dalykų turinys rodo, kad metodai (pvz., reklamos tekštų, muziejų eksponatų analizė), dalyvavimas tarpdisciplininiuose kursuose ir seminaruose padeda studentams pasiekti numatytaus studijų rezultatus. Galbūt būtų galima kiek pajairinti mokymo metodus (darbas grupėmis, darbų portfeliai, atvejų tyrimų praktinis taikymas).

Galima užtikrintai teigti, kad dauguma dėstytojų atlieka mokslinius tyrimus toje pačioje srityje, kurios dalykus dėsto. Profesorius Sverdiolas veda pusiau neformalų tarpdisciplininių seminarų,

kuris įtrauktas į programą pavadinimu „Tyrimų seminaras“. Vertinimo komisija mano, kad tai – vertingas indėlis į Semiotikos magistro programos „reklamavimą“ ir viena iš priemonių ar platformų reguliariai atnaujinti programos dėstytojų kolektyvą ir dėstomų dalykų turinį.

Nors darbuotojų skaičius adekvatus, didesnis darbuotojų skaičius padidintų jų mobilumo galimybes, nors vertinimo komisijos nariai taip pat žino, kad mobilumas yra susijęs su galimais finansiniais Vilniaus universiteto apribojimais.

Studentai turi neribotą prieigą prie visų VU bibliotekos resursų, išskaitant bibliotekos prenumeruojamas duomenų bazes. Be to, A. J. Greimo semiotikos ir literatūros teorijos centre sukaupta įspūdinga akademinių literatūros kolekcija. Pasak savianalizės suvestinės, planuojama kai kuriuos A. J. Greimo veikalus išversti į anglų kalbą, kad juos galėtų skaityti nelabai gerai prancūzų kalbą mokantys studentai. Nereikalaujama, kad studentai studijų metu atliktų praktiką ir taip įgytų akademinių žinių taikymo sprendžiant praktinius uždavinius patirties. Kita vertus, studentai dalyvauja kasmetinėse vasaros stovyklose, kurios suteikia naudingos patirties, įgyjamos už auditorijų ribų.

Diskusijų su dėstytojais, studentais ir programos absolventais metu buvo akivaizdu, kad dėstytojai yra labai atviri ir pasiruošę padėti studentams, susidūrusiems su sunkumais studijuojant kurį nors dalyką. Studentai turi derinti darbą ir studijas. Galbūt studijas nutraukusių studentų skaičių padėtų sumažinti paskaitų ir seminarų laikų pertvarka.

Šioje ataskaitoje nuolat pabrėžiama, kad pagrindinis Semiotikos magistro programos privalumas – programos unikalumas, aukštas dėstytojų profesionalumas, jų neįprastas entuziazmas ir ypač stipri parama studentams, kurie programą vertina išskirtinai teigiamai. Tai, kad dėstytojai labai atsidavę ir motyvuoti, yra ne mažiau svarbu nei jų tiriamieji ir akademiniai įgūdžiai. Programą derėtų plačiau reklamuoti, išgryninti jos rinkodaros strategiją. I programą įtraukus kursus anglų kalba, didesnis mobilumas (kuris valdomas fakulteto ir universiteto administracijos lygmeniu) taip pat prisidėtų prie didesnio tarptautinio susidomėjimo programa (kuris jau egzistuoja, nes dėstyti reguliariai kviečiami žinomi lektoriai).

<...>

### **III. REKOMENDACIJOS**

1. Studijų programa turėtų siūlyti daugiau kursų ir literatūros anglų kalba, kad patrauktų užsienio mokslininkų ir studentų dėmesį, nes programos turinys išties unikalus.
2. Galima būtų apsvarstyti lankstesnį paskaitų ir seminarų laiką.
3. Galima būtų apsvarstyti kurso „Kalbos metateorijos“ turinio reorganizavimą. Vienas iš galimų sprendimų – padalyti jį į du atskirus kursus. Kursas reikšmingai papildo semiotikos teoriją ir kitas temas (tokias kaip lyčių teorija). Be to, kurse pateikiama filosofinių klausimų apie prasmę ir realybę apžvalga.
4. Radus daugiau socialinių partnerių, galėtų susiformuoti stipresnis ryšys tarp šios magistro programos ir šalies socialinių poreikių.
5. Studentams paskyrus magistro darbo konsultantus ar vadovus, pastarieji galėtų padėti studentams tikslingiau rinktis pasirenkamuosius dalykus.

<...>

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)