



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus dailės akademijos (Vilniaus fakulteto)
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS „SKULPTŪRA“
(valstybinis kodas - 621W10006)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF "SCULPTURE" (state code - 621W10006)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Vilnius Art Academy (Vilnius Faculty)

Review' team:

1. **Dr. Sarah Bennett (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Doc. Dr. Eugenia Loginova,** *academic,*
3. **Doc. Dr. Karen Harsbo,** *academic,*
4. **Prof. Dr. Richard Launder,** *academic,*
5. **Ms Asta Vaičiulytė,** *representative of social partners'*
6. **Ms Rūta Stankutė,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator -

Mrs Kristina Maldonienė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Skulptūra</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621W10006
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis	Dailė
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (2 metai)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Dailės magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1997-05-19

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Sculpture</i>
State code	621W10006
Study area	Arts
Study field	Art studies
Type of the study programme	University
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2 years)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Arts
Date of registration of the study programme	1997-05-19

© 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	8
2.3. Teaching staff	10
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	12
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	13
2.6. Programme management	17
2.7. Examples of excellence	19
III. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	20
IV. SUMMARY	22
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	6

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.

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

Vilnius Faculty of VAA (VAA VF) is an integral structural part of Vilnius Academy of Arts. VAA is a state school of higher education of arts organising university first-cycle, masters, special vocational, integrated, third-cycle, doctoral studies, performing research and developing high-level professional artistic activities. It is an autonomous institution carrying out independent academic, administrative, economic and financial management activities based on the principle of self-government, academic freedom, and defined in the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania, the Law on Higher Education and the Statute of the Academy.

The VAA community, including VAA Vilnius Faculty, VAA Kaunas Faculty, VAA Telšiai Faculty and VAA Klaipėda Faculty, sees itself as an educational institution of visual arts, recognised by its programme and value provisions, socially oriented staff of highly skilled artists and pedagogues, seeking to implement cutting-edge art technologies and capable of preparing professional artists, designers, architects who can compete in the art market, as well as experts in humanities and social science (art critics, cultural management professionals). The most talented graduates of the Academy comprise a significant part of the Lithuanian cultural elite producing art works that are recognised and appreciated in Europe and around the world.

VAA VF implements two-cycle university study programmes in arts: bachelor's and master's. The Departments comprise - Architecture Department, Fine Arts Educational Centre, Art History and Theory Department, Design Department, Photography and Multimedia Art Department with animation, photography and multimedia studies, Graphic Art Department, Graphic Design Department, Interior Design Department, Language Teaching Centre, Ceramics Department, Costume Design Department, Monumental Painting and Scenography Department, Artworks Restoration and Conservation Department, Drawing Department, Sculpture Department, Painting Department, Textile Department, UNESCO Culture Management and Culture Politics Department, library, laboratories and the Open School of Arts, Design and Architecture of VAA.

The Sculpture Department has been implementing the study programme in the field of Sculpture since 1940-1941; an informal study programme committee was gathered in 1989 and was formalised after an international accreditation, when the Department of Postgraduate Studies was established. The Sculpture Department coordinates the training of specialists of Sculpture of the first-cycle and second-cycle university studies, in this case the MA Sculpture study Programme with contemporary specialism. In 2008, when the International Accreditation Committee was carrying out an external evaluation of the VAA programmes, in Vilnius, the Sculpture Department programme was accredited for 6 years. An extension was granted to that accreditation, as the 2017 evaluation is their second accreditation.

The evaluation of the Programme has been conducted by an international team assembled by the SKVC (see 1.4 below). In this work the team has followed the legal requirements and methodological guidelines, established for higher education institutions in Lithuania. The international expert group undertook its evaluation based on the information provided in the Self-Evaluation Report (hereinafter – SER), the submitted additional information by the VAA VF and the observations made during the site visit to the VF. Following the visit, the views and findings of the review team members were discussed, which are reflected in this report.

1.4. 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 *6/April/2017*.

- 1. Dr. Sarah Bennett (team leader)**, *Kingston University Head of The School of Art and Architecture, United Kingdom.*
- 2. Doc. Dr. Eugenia Loginova**, *Art Academy of Latvia, lecturer, Latvia*
- 3. Doc. Dr. Karen Harsbo**, *Royal Danish Academy of Fine Art, lecturer, Denmark.*
- 4. Prof. Dr. Richard Launder**, *University of Bergen, Institute of Art & Design, lecturer, Norway.*
- 5. Ms Asta Vaičiulytė**, *Contemporary Art Centre, curator and editor, Lithuania.*
- 6. Ms Rūta Stankutė**, *student of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

In the expert opinion of the review team the MA programme aims and learning outcomes are well-defined and clear. They are publicly announced on the website (www.vda.lt). They satisfy the needs of the students, graduates and social stakeholders at a very high level, as evidenced in the conversations at student and alumni meetings and the preparedness for stakeholders to employ students and graduates and offer opportunities for engagement in their organisations. The way that art practice intersects with society and its needs is not always direct, but takes the form of, for example, increased well-being, access to cultural events and resulting civic pride, the enrichment of the lived environment through artefacts and artistic interventions, engagement in critical ideas and questions through artworks. Alternatively put *the vision of the art world [is] incomplete without the aspect of the public identity, quality of social life, where, according to their understanding, art may have an important role* (SER p43). The possibility for success in these aspects of interconnection with society are seen by the review team in the learning outcomes (e.g. LOs C3, D1, D2 and E3) and in some of the graduate career paths outlined in 2.5, hence programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the state, societal and labour market needs. The review team does recommend that the programme could involve more collaborative, socially engaged and contextual thinking projects (all very current art zones); which might then have a positive impact for students to become increasingly socially inclined. The strong relationships with social partners that the

review team heard about in the meetings with alumni and social partners facilitates the building of essential professional exhibition and curatorial networks that support postgraduate students in their transition to the professional arts sector (LOs A2 and E3).

The main objective of the programme, to prepare contemporary (sculpture) artists having their own artistic identity and ready to reflect and participate in the local and international art field (SER p9) is evidenced in the quality and breadth of student work as well as exhibitions, and meets the professional requirements of the graduates (LOs A2, C3, D1 and E3). This professional standing of students is supported by the week-long group exhibitions of the work of the students of all years held at the end of each semester that are open to external visitors; as well as an encouragement to generate creative ideas [...] *within the context of art discourses of the recent past, perpetually reviewing them in a critical manner* (SER p11). The review team is convinced that programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to professional requirements (though there are some professional skills lacking that is addressed in 2.2 below). The review team are pleased to see that the conceptualisation of materiality is a common feature of the student work (LO C1). The review team commend the programme for its clear focus on researching installation as the main media on the level of MA studies in a contextual way thus developing the understanding and skills of artistic research and contemporary artistic practices (LO B3) (SER p9).

Independent learning and taking responsibility for their own learning and artistic direction is instilled in the students through the pedagogical approach to the field of contemporary sculpture i.e. *a perpetual process of critical discussions, constantly trying to re-substantiate the physical (material) reason for the existence of the sculptural object*. Being a personality-based study programme it is built on the diversity of personal experiences, views and approaches to artistic expression provided by both teachers of the department and visiting practitioners and theoreticians. It corresponds to the mission and operational objectives of VAA VF which sees itself as an *educational institution of visual arts, recognised by its views on study programmes and values, its socially-oriented staff of highly skilled artists and pedagogues, seeking to implement cutting-edge art technologies and capable of preparing professional artists...* (SER p4).

The review team recommends that a theoretical base more consistently integrated in the study process through theory courses, critical discussions, reading groups and critical writing, would offer a deeper learning opportunity (see below 2.2). This is especially important at the level of MA studies in order to meet the programme objective to *...be familiar with and would be able to freely make use of and have a polemic with contemporary art theories...*(SER p9). This would assist the MA course in developing a more distinct step from the BA level of studies and would further

support graduates towards third-cycle studies (LO A1). The review team also recommends that a greater degree of distinction between BA and MA is necessary – there is quite a different expectancy, indeed a step-up in terms of content – comprehension, challenge, complexity, depth of knowledge experience etc - the final works and thesis outcomes between the two - at MA level the critical, contextual thinking, writing ability needs to arrive at a highly perceptive level. This means that the identity of each programme needs clarifying to establish their particular relevant content, differences and quality expectancies.

Overall, the review team confirms that the title of the programme is appropriate, as understood in a contemporary context. It could possibly be changed to ‘Contemporary Sculpture’ to give emphasis to its strengths and differentiate it from the other Sculpture programmes in VAA, but the review team would be content for that to be the decision of VAA VF. The intended learning outcomes, the content of the programme and the qualification to be obtained are well aligned. The programme also corresponds to second-cycle of studies and the level of qualifications is comparable to other Masters programmes known to the evaluation team.

2.2. Curriculum design

The review team confirms that the programme structure is in line with the legislative requirements. The programme offers 120 ECTS with 30 credits being studied in each of 4 semesters. Within the programme the following are offered: Mandatory subjects of the study field, Thesis preparation and Thesis - these study field subjects, when combined add up to 93 credits and the legal requirement is 60 or more. There are also 27 credits in optional theoretical subjects and subjects of the study field, and the legal requirement is for 30 or less (SER p15).

The review team have considered whether the subjects of study field are taught in a consistent manner. During discussions with staff and students, and through reading the SER (pp16-17) and by reviewing the study plan (Annexes no.1 and no.2) the review team found that the acquisition of knowledge, understanding, practice and contextualisation of contemporary sculpture is gradually facilitated by a carefully designed curriculum within which the student is at the centre of their learning with the teachers and the subjects acting as a productive and consistent framework. Even when there are a number of similar subjects e.g. Contemporary Sculpture 1-3, these are designed to enable the student to incrementally develop their own topics and practice skills and research at their own pace, therefore the review team found no evidence of subjects being repeated. It is less clear whether all the electives are taught in a consistent manner, due to the range and breadth of subjects available. In the area of Art in Public Space (MM0036) which the department is clearly active

within (artist-driven, not commission orientated), the City Municipality did not understand giving of permission for working in public space – this a common issue internationally where officials are shutting-down/restricting usage of public space (often with ‘security’ as their alibi) and the review team are sympathetic to the problems involved and wish to add their expert voice, through a related recommendation, to helping this become an open territory for art practice in the future, as it is such a prevalent area in contemporary art practice and therefore highly relevant for students to gain experience in.

Through the SER and viewing documentation of the artwork and its presentation the review team was assured that the content of subjects corresponds to second-cycle studies in the study field of sculpture (specialism is contemporary sculpture). The review team also note that the programme aims to prepare students for third cycle studies (LO A1).

The review team confirm that the scope of the programme and the content of the study field subjects and related study methods such as lectures, practice sessions and individual work enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes, evidenced by the subject content and delivery methods, the quality of final projects and the graduate destinations. One area for comment is that in the SER (p18) a lack of relevance to contemporary sculpture of generic humanities subjects such as art history was referred to – a lack identified by students that appears to limit their access to contemporary art theory in the humanities subjects at a level commensurate with Masters study in the arts. The review team commend the department staff on the way they have mobilised their resources to address this gap through invited artists, critics and other cultural commentators (e.g. LOs A1, A3 and C3). There are also a further range of compensatory strategies to ensure that students achieve the relevant learning outcomes, such as the *Investigation Bureau* series (see BA study plan and MA SER p19) that MA students can attend alongside the BA students, field trips and international exhibitions. The review team also note that contemporary theory is integrated into studio teaching (SER p16), a model that is widely used and highly respected across Higher Education Institutions of Arts in Europe. The review team would recommend that the Faculty considers whether, at Masters level, subject experts should deliver all theory from *within* the department so it is fully integrated. An additional recommendation is for student-led seminars, which would offer an effective learning opportunity alongside students’ self-initiated reading groups - as adjuncts to other strategies. This would build on the excellent rapport and support that MA students share with BA students. In terms of professional skills, the generic subject SM0002 *Management and Marketing for an Artist* does not appear to meet the specific needs of postgraduate sculpture students. Social Partner, Alumni and Students stated that there is an urgent need for subjects to cover grant funding proposal writing, residency application writing, and project proposal

writing, which they voiced they were badly equipped for – it was also noted that folio presentation was poor. The review team recommends that the department initiate this as soon as possible – perhaps initially including the alumni (as Life Long Learning) so they could ‘catch-up’. This will equip all with the capacity to successfully obtain grants/funding, win commissions, get project support, fund exhibitions and generally to deal with bureaucracy – arranged as a part of a ‘professional artist introduction’ type workshop that the social partners could contribute to (please note this should also be introduced at BA).

Notable in the Masters study programme in Contemporary Sculpture is the level of engagement with and integration of artistic research methods in the programme (SER p16/17 and Annex no.2). This reflects current debates across the HE arts sector in Europe and valuably connects Vilnius students and staff to wider research contexts and questions. The review team saw in the documentation of artworks discussed by the teaching staff that students are ambitious and agile (LO E1) and capable of making informed choices relating to contemporary and traditional materials and media, both formal and conceptual implications linked to presentational approaches that places their work in an international context. They are not hidebound by ‘style’ but are facilitated to make decisions about their own artistic directions (LO D2). The review team note that there are no explicit subjects in the MA curriculum related to new technology, but that students are well served by the Digital Laboratory and have established their technical skill sets on their first cycle studies so extend these within the study subjects with the support of teaching staff. The Review team considers that the content of the programme corresponds to the latest academic, artistic or technological achievements.

2.3. Teaching staff

The Master’s programme is taught by 7 permanent teachers of VAA. Additionally, visiting lecturers are hired and the review team confirm that this corresponds to the legal act requirements i.e. no less than 80% of all study subjects teachers must have a scientific degree, or to be recognized artists and no less than 20% of major study field subjects’ volume has to be taught by teachers holding a Professors academic degree (SER p21), evidenced in Annex nos.3 and 4.

The academic staff in VAA are hired through open competition for a period of 5 years in accordance with the prescribed legal requirements and the Description of Qualification Requirements for the Positions of Teaching Scientists and Artists and the Procedure of Organising the Certification and Competitions to Hold the Positions as well as the Procedure of Awarding Pedagogical Titles at VAA VF Approved by the Resolution of 26 May 2010 of the Senate of VAA.

The criteria used to appoint competent teachers are appropriate to the level and cycle of study and includes active artistic (scientific) activity. Individual lecturers are also hired by signing fixed-term employment contracts for a period of one year with a possibility to extend the contract (SER p21). A unique process of student choice is exercised in the department in order to establish the amount of teaching each staff member does and an aspect of their salary (SER p19 and p21), overseen by the Head of Department who allocates workloads. This is done via an internal agreement by the teachers because it is at variance with the VAA Study Regulations and the terms of VAA Employee Time Structure and Time Remuneration. The review team had some initial concerns about the way students might 'follow trends' or value the staff representing 'flavours of the month'. However, the review team was reassured through the various meetings that this approach motivates staff to constantly review their knowledge and artistic activities, so providing a high quality learning experience for Masters students, including long term support rather than a form of market competition. It was explained by Faculty Administration that students exert their responsibility by reviewing the publically available reports on teachers and are able to recognise the integrity of staff.

The qualifications and pedagogical experience of the teaching staff, and their number are more than adequate to ensure the learning outcomes - comprising 3 professors, 2 docents and 2 lectors (see Annex no.3 and no.4). The integration of contemporary theory and authentic artistic research within the speciality studies - differentiated from the limiting methods of scientific research - are made possible through the experience and intellectual level of staff (LOs A1, A3, B1 and B2). The review team found it unusual that it was only within the visiting artists and critics series that they read about female artists/critics contributing to a contemporary sculpture programme of study, and recommend that this would be a matter to usefully discuss within the department when there are forthcoming opportunities for new appointments.

In terms of turnover of teaching staff enabling an adequate provision of the programme the review team notes that the faculty can positively decide to appoint individual teachers for a year or more and that the comprehensive list of prominent visiting artists and critics from Lithuania, Europe and America (SER p20) provide students with access to a breadth of artistic and critical positions (LOs A2 and B3). This is balanced by the consistent input of the 7 teachers amongst whom there are recently appointed staff who have enhanced the breadth of references to contemporary ideas and art debates, and between all 7 staff they encompass a healthy range of critical and artistic positions and expertise, thus ensuring the scope and provision of the sculpture programme (LOs A1 and C1).

The review team congratulate VAA and the Faculty on the design of the Systematic Professional Development of staff (SER p22), which is evidence that VAA VF ensures conditions for

professional upgrading of staff necessary to implement the programme. Additionally the review team were particularly impressed by the range and quality of activities for students instigated by teaching staff such as themed seminars and trips, conference attendance, exhibitions and workshops. It is clear (Annex no.3 and no.4) that the permanent staff are fully engaged in professional artistic research activities, exhibitions, and debates at an international level (SER pp22-23) and this enables students to understand their own potential contributions to the global context in the arts (LOs C3 and D1). Staff have been supported to visit the Venice Biennial, Dokumenta; the Gdansk (PL) Reitveldt (NL) Dusseldorf (D) Academies; connecting into peer groups such as the Scandinavian: Nordic Network, Erasmus, etc. But funding is limited, sometimes trips are partially self-funded – so the review team wishes to recommend that the VAA further enhance opportunities for faculty to apply for Professional Development funding. Staff stated that the situation has improved, so the review team support moves for further improvement for this facet, which staff view as an extended tool of artistic research, also affording important networking dialogues.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The premises for studies are adequate both in size and quality for the present amount of students at the Sculpture programme. There are 12 studios with shared space for 3 to 6 students, distributed in 5 different buildings on the VAA VF campus (SER p23). The studios have renewed heating, lighting and ventilation and appeared light and spacious. However the issue of space allocation needs to be kept under review in relation to admissions number of students in the department.

The review team commend the Faculty on the improvements made since the last evaluation in 2008 with the new facilities in the VAA Art and Design laboratory. During the tour of the laboratory the review team were presented to the scope of possibilities the students can use (not specified in SER). Laser-cutting, diverse specialized machinery for wood and metal work, spray painting and a state of the art CNC milling machine operated by an employed specialist. The system whereby students can sign up via the intranet to book time at the different machinery works well, and hand tools can be borrowed to studios after registration. Basic materials are available for free to students. Safety regulations are taught and there are safety instruction boards in English and Lithuanian. However the centralisation of technical support puts a large load on the workshops of the Art and Design Laboratory due to the increased total number of students using them, especially towards the end of semester and the Faculty needs to keep the issue under review. Other facilities the students have access to: video lab, print lab and a computer classroom with updated software. For techniques other than those available in VAA the staff encourage (teacher meeting) students to be involved with outside partners, which is a negotiation skill artists also need.

There are adequate possibilities for students' practice both in the VAA and its creative bases (SER p24) and through collaborations with social partners. Students have exhibitions outside the Academy: Vilnius Art fair, Contemporary Art Center, galleries (social partner meeting) and collaborate with other universities, especially for technology (student meeting). The Sculpture department prioritise field trips to international art venues like Documenta, Venice and Münster, funded partly externally. It was mentioned in the meeting with the social partners that they would like to encourage students to set up artist run spaces.

Teachers and students have access to VAA library and its divisions and to its several subscribed international and national databases (SER p25.) The central library is spacious and houses large collections, but it was mentioned (SER meeting) that new acquisition wishes from the department were not taken into account, which makes the library less relevant regarding the most recent developments in contemporary art and thinking. The review team recommend that the Administration should address this issue. The sculpture department has a collection of publications mostly through the teachers' own personal initiative, but do not have a budget of its own for the purpose. The policy of the Academy (administration meeting) is to buy books centrally and not have books in small department libraries as it would work against interdisciplinary purposes. The students mentioned that the library at the Contemporary Art Centre in Vilnius was used often and of high quality.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

Entrance requirements are well-founded, consistent and transparent. The special commission of the Faculty of Postgraduate Studies approved by the Rector, oversees admissions according to the Rules for Admission to the second-cycle Studies of VAA VF 2016. Admission is achieved by way of competition involving: grades from Bachelors study; a grading given to a creative portfolio; and an interview process. The commission comprises 1–2 lecturers from each department of VAA involved in the MA studies in the Art study field who make a joint decision of the commission (SER p26). In 2012 there were 13 applicants comprising 4 male and 9 female of which 7 were admitted to the programme. By 2016 the applicant rate had reduced to 3 male and 3 female, so 6 applicants in total (SER p27) of which 5 were admitted to the programme, i.e. a higher admittance percentage. In the period of analysis between 2012 and 2016 the numbers graduating from the programme fluctuated between 3 and 8 per annum, due to personal reasons for interruptions to study (SER p27). Reasons for quitting studies range from pressures of other work, changed priorities or inability to reconcile work with study requirements when working in fields other than

their speciality, due to reasons related to activities abroad, change in priorities or not wanting to prepare the research paper. The review team consider this data to be quite within normal levels of expectation, though disappointing.

The duration of the studies is divided into 2 academic (full calendar) years comprised of autumn and spring semesters, each of 20 weeks. Each semester lasts 20 weeks, which is long enough in duration for the programme to be implemented and learning outcomes achieved. Fittingly, at Masters level, the programme is led by the MA students' own topics and they have the privilege to choose a supervisor whose expertise aligns with their research theme. Students complete the research (theoretical) work during semesters 1, 2 and 3 then complete their artistic practice in semester 4 enabling them to consolidate their subject and realise it in material/visual form with a depth of analytical acuity. The statement setting out the approach to student centred learning involving self-reflection, independent practice, critical analysis, experimentation, contextualisation etc. in the SER (p28) provides a summary to what is, in the view of the review team, an exemplary ethos that facilitates the learning outcomes, evidenced in the artwork the review team saw. The range of study methods used (SER p29) are further proof of the suitability of the suitably organised programme and this was endorsed by the students and alumni that the review team met. Elective and mandatory subjects are distributed through the 4 semesters and reviews and examinations (public) are evenly spaced.

In the introduction to the SER (p4) the high quality artistic activities which include artistic research (equivalent to scientific) of VAA VF are highlighted in the first sentence, this emphasises one of the key characteristics of the faculty. It is a mainstay of the teaching staff (SER p40), and a central criteria for selecting staff, so it is not surprising that the students are also involved in artistic activities and presenting their works in public. For example: participation in the 'Art Vilnius' fair in 2013 and 2016 (with one student in 2013 being awarded best young artist); participation in the Rupert art education programme in 2013-2014; one student put on an exhibition at Komplot Gallery in Brussels with other participants (2014); curating the VAA expo space with the exhibition 'Titanic'; and students taking part in CAC curated shows 'Auditas' (2012) and 'The unanswered Q' (2014), amongst others (SER p36).

VAA is involved in student mobility opportunities through Erasmus+, Kuno, and Nordplus (through Cirrus). VAA has signed 162 Erasmus+ agreements with participating higher schools of art and design, and in 2016 this was extended to Monterey University in Mexico, Bezalel Academy in Israel, University of Montenegro. Agreements of inter-institutional academic mobility are with universities in Brazil, Japan, USA, Switzerland, Russia, Ukraine, Belarus. However MA students

have not been taking exchange opportunities recently due to family, work and personal commitments, but they have international experience through other aspects of the programme. The review team can confirm that the conditions exist through support and information if some students do wish to participate in an exchange in future.

VAA KF ensures proper academic and social support for students, as it is described in the SER (pp31-32). The student body is represented by and informed of matters relating to the study programme through student representatives, the Students' Representative Council, the website (www.vda.lt), the Dean's Office of VAA, and through consultations with the Head and teaching staff of the department, supplemented by email and information posted on notice boards. The latter includes opportunities to participate in exhibitions, contests, etc. The Department also collects and stores data related to the implementation of the study programme that students can access. Academic support is available flexibly and through face to face contact, emails or phone with all the teachers who can advise on any organisational aspects, academic progress, study abroad, career routes and specific procedural matters such as retaking an exam (subject to VAA regulations and approval of the Dean). Study process, interim and final reviews are also used as feedback opportunities to find out if students are content with the level of consultation about their learning experience. There is also qualified psychological help for students at VAA reflecting the importance of the Programme for the Promotion of Mental Health. Recreational facilities are also available. Awarding of scholarships and benefits is regulated by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania, according The Regulations on the Granting of Scholarships of VAA VF. However, in the SER it is observed that financing is not adequate to satisfy students' requirement for benefits (SER p31-32). Scholarship funding is democratically shared between all students in the department.

Student achievement and assessment is based on *reliability, clarity, efficiency and impartiality* and enacted through criteria aligned with the learning outcomes using a 10-point grading scale according with the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania and the Study Regulations of VAA. Grades 10-5 are a pass (excellent to sufficient) and grades 4-1 are unsatisfactory. In the SER (pp32-33) there is a clear outline of the how excellent, typical and threshold levels of achievement are understood and used to make assessment decisions and these are available to students at the start of the semester, along with expected learning outcomes and assessment process, as well as publicly available. The review team support the programme team in stating (SER p33) that in the area of creative arts it is not fully possible to fully enact a cumulative grading system because of the contingent nature of arts practice, but the review team consider that by involving a rigorous evaluation committee fair assessment is assured. Interim and final reviews

take place each semester and students receive oral feedback and can request other forms of feedback. The final thesis is *evaluated by the commission of the department's lecturers as well as artists, scientists and professional practitioners from other higher schools proposed by the Dean of the Faculty and approved by the Rector*. It is attended by social partners, employers, representatives of professional associations, parents, former graduates, representatives of public institutions. The review team therefore confirm that the system of assessing student achievements is clear, public and appropriate to assess the learning outcomes.

The review team confirm that the professional activities of the majority of programme graduates correspond to the expectations of programme operators and employers, and to *economic, social and cultural and future development needs*. This was evidenced through the meetings with alumni and social partners and hearing about the value of the cultural activities and the graduates' contributions across the art sector that, as experts, the review team understands interconnects with societal contexts, well-being and the economy. The graduates are also promoting the cultural life of Lithuania through participation in the Venice Biennale - 7 out of 10 times that Lithuania attended, the country was represented by a graduate of VAA VF Sculpture department (SER p36). The Department has also undertaken data collection on graduate destinations that tell the review team that, out of 11 responses from graduates 2012-2016, 9 of them work in the art field: *3 of them have the Art Creator Status, 2 are members of the Lithuanian Interdisciplinary Artists' Association, 1 member of the Lithuanian Artists' Association*. The 2 others in the survey are in other employment, but as the means to finance their creative practice (SER p37). Graduates contribute also to the wider cultural field through theatre scenography, cinema studios, curating galleries, museums and art centres, teaching sculpture or drawing in art schools.

A fair learning environment is ensured through a number of checks and balances: firstly the VAA has a policy for the prevention of intolerance and discrimination and the VAA Ethics Committee can address any related issues (SER p6); the study programme committee oversees quality assurance that determines the learning context and environment; the students can write to members of the Study Programme Committee to raise any issues; there are surveys undertaken regularly; and the students opinions are invited at reviews, and ongoingly in informal contexts (SER p40) which they prefer. The review team recommends that the administration of VAA, whilst using anonymous questionnaires, should maintain more effective ways of official feedback. Students can lodge appeals against the grading of their review evaluations or final thesis (SER p34).

2.6. Programme management

The process of study programme administration and quality assurance is regulated by the Study Regulations of VAA (SER p37). In terms of the Quality Assessment Assurance Policy the Study Programme Committee (meeting twice per year) works well and in addition to addressing academic and operational matters through monitoring and implementation of change, pertaining to the department, the committee also receives matters and decisions from VAA Senate and the Faculty Council. It is valued by its members (listed p38-39), i.e. staff, social partners, alumni and one student who was in the SER meeting, but other students we met were unaware of its function and we recommend that this is addressed. However, students clearly do influence change through informal dialogue with staff, so any formal processes should be 'light touch'.

In the meetings with the SER group and teachers the review team were told that the QA has helped the department to define what qualities it needed for a contemporary sculpture/art education and the studies were then diverted toward the results of this, which were agreed upon by student, academy, social partners and graduate representatives. This study programme can then be renewed/changed based upon reviewing the results of data collection and surveys, as well as previous evaluation recommendations. In the SER (p42) it states that the 2008 evaluation led to updating the study programme and maintaining its quality. For example the review team sees that the lack of computers in 2008 has been improved via the digital laboratory and the review team saw that a stated lack of links with industries/professions in decline - evident in 2008 - has been addressed and there are now very positive informal links with social partners, and formal agreements are working well and they were very positive on the ambitions of the graduates. Being the capital and centre of the Lithuanian art scene, naturally many of the social partners are galleries - both State and Independent: CAC, AV17, Meno Nisa Gallery, the Art Vilnius Art Fair all in particular supporting student and graduate exposure to curators, exhibitions, etc. The social partner representative is a member of the Study Programme Committee, where formal input to the programme evaluation is also made.

As an example of Internal Quality Assurance, the review review team noted the initiative of VAA to organise an Annual Exhibition, curated at the Institutional level, of graduation works: *In Titanicas* – which received much support. However the Sculpture Department had no say in which works from its graduates were included; while, on the one hand a centrally appointed curator creates the possibility for neutrality, on the other this is a lost opportunity for sculpture staff to have a voice in the selection process – a situation which the review team suggest could be more balanced (SER p41).

Quantitative and qualitative information about the study programme is easily accessible to the public and potential applicants through the website of the Faculty of Postgraduate Studies of the VAA, on Facebook and the academic information system of the VAA, in publications and annual study fairs, and in booklets (SER p42). The review team commend the department for their successful admissions strategies that ensures a consistently healthy student cohort – both in quality and numbers, though it is noted that the department would welcome higher student numbers and so needs to continue to develop strategies to attract them. The review team commends work done by VAA towards attaining an exemption from the New State Admissions Regulation, which if successful, will greatly enhance admissions for the arts programmes. It is noted that a regular Conference in Vilnius acts as an ‘attractor’ for student recruitment (SER p27).

Data and other information regarding programme implementation are collected and analysed periodically, as evidenced in the SER, e.g. graduate destinations and careers, teaching staff profiles, application numbers and student opinions in surveys, online and informal through reviews and face-to-face meetings (see 2.5).

Final comment – the review team consider that since the last evaluation this programme has gone from strength to strength, the statement from students/alumni that they all name themselves as contemporary artist is a primary indicator to the programmes success. The Sculpture department contributes fundamentally to the cultural life of the city and country, and the review team see opportunities for it to increasingly contribute to the international contemporary arts context.

2.7. Examples of excellence

1. The review team commend the programme for its clear focus on researching installation as the main media on the level of MA studies in a contextual way thus developing the understanding and skills of artistic research and contemporary artistic practices.
2. The review team commend the department staff on the way they have mobilised their resources to address the theoretical gap through invited artists, critics and other cultural commentators and Investigation Bureau.
3. The review team commend the Faculty on the improvements made since the last evaluation in 2008 with the new facilities in the VAA Art and Design laboratory.
4. The review team commends work done by VAA towards attaining an exemption from the New State Admissions Regulation, which if successful, will greatly enhance admissions for the arts programmes.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The review team recommends that the Faculty considers whether, at Masters level, subject experts should deliver integrated theory/practice from *within* the department – resulting in a depth of critical engagement that would distinguish the MA from the BA.
2. The review team recommends that the programme could involve more collaborative, socially engaged and contextual thinking projects (all very current art zones); which might then have a positive impact for students to become increasingly socially inclined.
3. The review team also recommends that a greater degree of distinction between BA and MA programmes is necessary.
4. The review team wish to recommend that the Institution support the sculpture department with its connections to the City municipality in relation toward gaining permission for artist-driven works in public space.
5. The review team recommends that the department initiate a subject or workshop with the input of social partners (preferably) to cover grant funding proposal writing, residency application writing, project proposal writing, and folio presentation.
6. The review team recommend that the MA students take on the role of arrangers/presenters for student-led seminars where students develop an essay or presentation on their own works.
7. The review team recommends that the department should discuss the balance of gender within the core teaching staff when there are forthcoming opportunities for new appointments.
8. While congratulating VAA and the Faculty on the implementation of the Systematic Professional Development of staff, the review team recommends that the Institution further enhance opportunities for staff to apply for Professional Development funding as well as the levels of funding available.
9. However the review team recommends that the issue of space allocation needs to be kept under review in relation to admissions numbers in the department
10. The review team recommend that the Administration should ensure that new acquisition wishes from the department was are taken into account by the library.

11. The review team recommends that the administration of VAA, whilst using anonymous questionnaires, should maintain more effective ways of official feedback.
12. The review team recommends that the department ensures that all students understand the role of the Study Programme Committee and the contributions they can make.

IV. SUMMARY

In the expert opinion of the review team the MA programme aims and learning outcomes are well-defined and clear. They are publicly announced on the website (www.vda.lt). They satisfy the needs of the students, graduates and social stakeholders at a very high level. The review team does recommend that the programme could involve more collaborative, socially engaged and contextual thinking projects, and the review team wish to recommend that the VAA support the sculpture department with its connections to the City municipality in relation toward gaining permission for artist-driven works in public space. The main objective of the programme to prepare contemporary (sculpture) artists, having their own artistic identity and ready to reflect and participate in the local and international art field is evidenced in the quality and breadth of student work as well as exhibitions, and meets the professional requirements of the graduates. Independent learning and taking responsibility for their own artistic direction is instilled in the students through the pedagogical approach to the field of contemporary art. The review team recommends that a degree of distinction between BA and MA is necessary - this means that the identity of each programme needs clarifying to establish their particular relevant content, differences and quality expectancies. However, the programme does correspond to second-cycle of studies and the level of qualifications is comparable to other Masters programmes known to the review team.

The review team confirms that the programme structure is in line with the legal requirements for a Sculpture Master's study programme and was assured that the content of subjects corresponds to second cycle studies (Contemporary Sculpture Specialisation). The review team confirm that the subjects of study field are taught in a consistent manner and that the acquisition of knowledge, understanding, practice and contextualisation of contemporary sculpture is facilitated by a carefully designed curriculum within which the student is at the centre of their learning with the teachers as a productive and consistent support. The review team found no evidence of subjects being repeated but they are designed to enable the student to incrementally develop practice skills and research topics at their own pace. The review team confirm that the scope of the programme and the content of the study field subjects and related study methods enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes, evidenced by the subject content and delivery methods, the high quality of final projects and graduate destinations. The review team commends the sculpture department staff for mobilising their resources to address a lack in contemporary art subjects. The review team recommends that at Masters level, subject experts should deliver integrated theory/practice from *within* the department. The review team recommends that the department initiate a subject or

workshop to cover art related skills for bid writing. The review team considers that the programme content corresponds very well to the latest academic, artistic or technological achievements.

The review team confirm that the number of staff and their qualifications meet the legal requirements for the MA Sculpture study programme. The criteria used to appoint competent teachers are appropriate to second-cycle level and includes active artistic activity. The qualifications of the teaching staff and the quality of student work evidence the high standards of teaching and ensures the learning outcomes are achievable by the students. Certification is assessed every 5 years. The review team found that the involvement of students in selecting teachers encourages the motivation of staff who constantly review their pedagogical approaches and course content, so providing a high quality learning experience for students. The review team confirms that the turnover of teaching staff ensures an adequate provision of the programme. The integration of contemporary theory and authentic artistic research within the speciality studies are made possible through the experience and intellectual level of the staff who are involved with high profile international conferences, research, cultural events and exhibitions, supported by the systematic professional development. They are complimented by the comprehensive list of prominent international visiting artists and critics that provide a breadth of artistic and critical positions. Together this enables students to understand their place in a global arts context. The strong relationships with social partners focuses largely on access to curatorial skills and professional exhibition networks, spaces and opportunities, that support students in their postgraduate careers.

Renewed heating, lighting and ventilation in adequate size studios has improved the quality of the learning space, however the issue of space allocation needs to be kept under review in relation to admissions numbers in future. The new facilities in the VAA Art and Design laboratory are impressive, and the system whereby students can sign up via the intranet to book time at the different machinery works well. The review team saw that there are adequate possibilities for students' practice, but encouragement should be given for students to set up artist run spaces. New acquisition wishes from the department to the library should be taken into account, to make the library more relevant regarding the most recent developments in contemporary art and thinking.

Entrance requirements are well-founded, consistent and transparent. The approach to student centred learning involving self-reflection, independent practice, critical analysis, experimentation, contextualisation etc reflects an exemplary ethos that facilitates the learning outcomes, evidenced in the artwork the review team saw. The range of study methods used are further proof of the suitability of the organised programme and this was endorsed by the students and graduates. High quality artistic activities of VAA VF emphasise one of the key characteristics of the faculty,

regarding staff, students and graduates achievements. VAA VF ensures proper academic and social support for students. Student assessment is fair and based on *reliability, clarity, efficiency and impartiality* and enacted through criteria aligned with the learning outcomes. The thesis assessment is public and rigorously enacted. The review team confirm that the professional activities of the majority of programme graduates correspond to the expectations of programme operators and employers, and to *economic, social and cultural and future development needs*, evidenced through the meetings with alumni and social partners and understanding the contributions of graduates across the art sector. A fair learning environment is ensured through a number of checks and balances.

In terms of the Quality Assessment Assurance Policy the Study Programme Committee works well in addressing academic and operational matters of the department through monitoring and implementation of change. Students influence change through informal dialogue with staff, but need to properly understand the role of the Study Programme Committee. The review team notes that the 2008 evaluation led to updating the study programme and maintaining its quality. The social partner representative is a member of the Study Programme Committee, where formal input to the programme is also made. Information about the study programme is easily accessible to the public and potential applicants through the website of the Faculty of Postgraduate Studies of the VAA. The review team commend the department for their successful admissions strategies that ensures a consistently healthy student cohort – both in quality and numbers. Data and other information regarding programme implementation are collected and analysed periodically, such as graduate destinations and careers, teaching staff profiles, application numbers and student opinions in surveys. The review team consider that since the last evaluation this programme has gone from strength to strength, the statement from students/alumni that they all name themselves as *contemporary artist* is a primary indicator to the programmes success. The Sculpture department contributes fundamentally to the cultural life of the city and country, and we see opportunities for it to increasingly contribute to the international contemporary arts context.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Sculpture* (state code – 621W10006) at Vilnius Art Academy 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	4
4.	Facilities and learning resources	4
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	4
6.	Programme management	4
	Total:	22

*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:	Sarah Bennett
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Eugenia Loginova
	Karen Harsbo
	Richard Launder
	Ms Asta Vaičiulytė
	Ms Rūta Stankutė

**VILNIAUS DAILĖS AKADEMIJOS VILNIAUS FAKULTETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *SKULPTŪRA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621W10006) 2017-05-25
EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-94 IŠRAŠAS**

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Vilniaus dailės akademijos Vilniaus fakulteto studijų programa *Skulptūra* (valstybinis kodas – 621W10006) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	4
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	4
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	4
6.	Programos vadyba	4
	Iš viso:	22

* 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

Ekspertų grupės nuomone, magistrantūros studijų programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai yra gerai apibrėžti ir aiškūs. Jie yra viešai skelbiami interneto svetainėje (www.vda.lt) ir ypač atitinka studentų, absolventų ir socialinių dalininkų poreikius. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja į studijų programą įtraukti daugiau bendrų, socialiai atsakingų ir kontekstinį mąstymą skatinančių projektų. Ekspertai rekomenduoja VDA paremti Skulptūros katedrą, pasinaudoti ryšiais su miesto

savivaldybe ir gauti leidimą menininkams dirbti viešojoje erdvėje. Pagrindinį studijų programos tikslą rengti šiuolaikinius (skulptūros) menininkus, turinčius savo meninį identitetą ir pasirengusius vaizduoti ir dalyvauti vietos ir tarptautinėje meno srityje, patvirtina studentų darbų kokybė ir įvairovė, parodos. Tai atitinka absolventų profesinius reikalavimus. Studentai pasižymi savarankišku mokymusi ir atsakomybe už savo meninę kryptį; šiuos bruožus padėjo išsiugdyti dėstytojų pedagoginis požiūris į šiuolaikinio meno sritį. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja labiau išskirti bakalauro ir magistrantūros studijas, tai reiškia, kad reikia aiškiau apibrėžti kiekvienos studijų programos tapatybę, ypač nustatyti atitinkamą turinį, skirtumus ir kokybės lūkesčius. Vis dėlto, studijų programa atitinka studijų antrąją pakopą, o kvalifikacijų lygis yra panašus į kitas, ekspertų grupei žinomas, magistrantūros programas.

Ekspertų grupė patvirtina, kad studijų programos struktūra atitinka teisės aktų nustatytus reikalavimus magistrantūros studijų programai *Skulptūra*, ir įsitikino, kad dalykų turinys atitinka antrosios pakopos studijas (šiuolaikinės skulptūros specializaciją). Ekspertų grupė patvirtina, kad studijų dalykai dėstomi nuosekliai, įgyti šiuolaikinės skulptūros žinių, supratimo, praktikos įgūdžių ir suvokti kontekstą padeda kruopščiai parengtas studijų turinys, kuriame studentai yra mokymo centre, o dėstytojai jiems suteikia produktyvią ir nuoseklią pagalbą. Ekspertų grupė nepastebėjo, kad dalykai kartotųsi, jie parengti taip, kad studentai galėtų laipsniškai ugdyti praktinius įgūdžius ir plėtoti tyrimų temas pagal savo tempą. Ekspertų grupė patvirtina, kad studijų programos apimtis ir studijų krypties dalykų turinys bei susiję studijų metodai leidžia studentams pasiekti numatytus studijų rezultatus, kuriuos patvirtina dalykų turinys ir dėstymo metodai, aukšta baigiamųjų projektų kokybė ir absolventų užimamos vietos. Ekspertų grupė palankiai vertina Skulptūros katedros dėstytojus už gebėjimą sutelkti išteklius ir pašalinti šiuolaikinio meno dalykų trūkumą. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja, kad magistrantūros lygmeniu dalyko ekspertai dėstytojų integruotą teoriją ir praktiką pasitelkę pačios katedros išteklius. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja katedrai inicijuoti dalyką ar seminarą, kuris apimtų su menu susijusius įgūdžius, reikalingus parengti pasiūlymus konkursams. Ekspertų grupė mano, kad studijų programos turinys puikiai atitinka naujausius akademinis, meninius ar technologinius laimėjimus.

Ekspertų grupė patvirtina, kad personalo skaičius ir profesinė kvalifikacija atitinka teisinės aktų reikalavimus, nustatytus magistrantūros studijų programai. Kriterijai, taikomi skiriant kompetentingus dėstytojus, yra tinkami antrosios pakopos studijoms ir apima aktyvią meninę veiklą. Dėstytojų kvalifikacija ir studentų darbų kokybė rodo aukštus dėstymo standartus ir užtikrina studentų galimybes pasiekti studijų rezultatus. Atestacija atliekama kas 5 metus. Ekspertų grupė nustatė, kad studentų dalyvavimas atrenkant dėstytojus skatina dėstytojų, kurių ugdymo metodai ir dalyko turinys yra nuolat peržiūrimi, motyvaciją; tai leidžia užtikrinti, kad studentams

bus garantuotos kokybiškos studijos. Ekspertų grupė patvirtina, kad dėstytojų kaita užtikrina studijų programos tinkamą vykdymą. Šiuolaikinės teorijos ir autentiškų meninių mokslinių tyrimų integracija specialybės studijų metu yra galima, ją užtikrina dėstytojų aukšto lygio patirtis ir intelektualinis kapitalas. Dėstytojai dalyvauja aukšto lygio tarptautinėse konferencijose, moksliniuose tyrimuose, kultūros renginiuose ir parodose, jiems tobulėti padeda profesinio tobulėjo sistema. Dėstytojų darbą papildo nemenkas atvykstančių žinomų užsienio menininkų ir kritikų, kurie išreiškia savo menines ir kritines pozicijas, skaičius. Kartu tai leidžia studentams suprasti savo vietą pasaulinio meno kontekste. Tvirti ryšiai su socialiniais partneriais padeda užtikrinti prieigą prie kuratorių ir profesionalams skirtų parodų tinklų, erdvių ir galimybių, padedančių absolventams siekti karjeros baigus studijas.

Tinkamo dydžio studijose atnaujintas šildymas, apšvietimas ir vėdinimas pagerino mokymosi erdvę, tačiau patalpų paskirstymo klausimą reikia nuolat stebėti, atsižvelgiant į studentų skaičių ateityje. Naujos VDA Meno ir dizaino laboratorijos patalpos yra išpūdingos, gerai veikia sistema, skirta studentams intranetu užsisakyti laiką dirbti įvairia technika. Ekspertų grupė mano, kad galimybės studentams atlikti praktiką yra tinkamos, tačiau reikia skatinti studentus kurti erdves, kurioms vadovautų menininkai. Biblioteka turėtų atsižvelgti į katedros pageidavimus įsigyti naujų išteklių, kad biblioteka labiau atitiktų naujausius šiuolaikinio meno aspektus.

Priėmimo reikalavimai yra tinkamai apibrėžti, nuoseklūs ir skaidrūs. Į studentą orientuotos studijos, apimančios savęs įvertinimą, savarankišką darbą, kritinę analizę, eksperimentavimą, kontekstualizaciją ir kita, rodo pavyzdinį etosą, kuris padeda siekti studijų rezultatų. Tai atsispindi meno darbuose, kuriuos matė ekspertų grupė. Taikomų studijų metodų spektras įrodo vykdomos studijų programos tinkamumą, tai patvirtino studentai ir absolventai. VDA VF aukštos kokybės meninė veikla pabrėžia vieną iš pagrindinių fakulteto bruožų, susijusių su dėstytojų, studentų ir absolventų pasiekimais. VDA VF studentams užtikrina tinkamą akademinę ir socialinę paramą. Studentų vertinimas yra sąžiningas ir pagrįstas *patikimumu, aiškumu, veiksmingumu ir nešališkumu* ir vykdomas taikant kriterijus, suderintus su studijų rezultatais. Baigiamųjų darbų vertinimas yra viešas ir vykdomas griežtai laikantis reikalavimų. Ekspertų grupė patvirtina, kad daugumos studijų programos absolventų profesinė veikla atitinka programos vykdytojų ir darbdavių lūkesčius, *ekonominius, socialinius ir kultūrinius bei būsimos veiklos poreikius*. Tai per susitikimus patvirtino absolventai ir socialiniai partneriai ir atsižvelgiant į absolventų indėlį meno sektoriuje. Tinkamą mokymosi aplinką užtikrina atliekami patikrinimai ir balansas.

Kalbant apie kokybės vertinimo ir užtikrinimo politiką, Studijų programos komitetas dirba gerai, sprenddamas katedros akademinius ir einamuosius veiklos klausimus, stebi bei įgyvendina pokyčius.

Studentai įtaką pokyčiams daro neoficialiai bendraudami su dėstytojais, tačiau turi tinkamai suprasti Studijų programos komiteto vaidmenį. Ekspertų grupė pastebi, kad, atsižvelgiant į 2008 m. atliktą vertinimą, buvo atnaujinta studijų programa ir išlaikyta jos kokybė. Socialinio partnerio atstovas yra Studijų programos komiteto narys ir taip pat formaliai prisideda prie studijų programos tobulinimo. Informacija apie studijų programą yra lengvai prieinama visuomenei ir potencialiems pareiškėjams VDA antrosios ir trečios pakopų studijų interneto svetainėje. Ekspertų grupė giria katedrą už sėkmingą studentų priėmimo strategiją, kuri pastoviai užtikrina tinkamą studentų grupę tiek kokybės, tiek skaičiaus prasme. Duomenys ir kita informacija apie studijų programos vykdymą periodiškai renkama ir analizuojama, pvz., renkama informacija apie absolventų užimtumą ir karjerą, dėstytojų profilius, paraiškų skaičių ir studentų nuomones, kurias jie pateikia per apklausas. Ekspertų grupė mano, kad nuo paskutiniojo vertinimo ši studijų programa dar labiau sustiprėjo ir studentų bei absolventų teiginiai, kad jie visi save vadina šiuolaikiniais menininkais, yra pagrindinis studijų programos sėkmės rodiklis. Skulptūros katedra iš esmės prisideda prie miesto ir šalies kultūrinio gyvenimo. Ekspertų grupė mato galimybių dar labiau prisidėti prie tarptautinio šiuolaikinio meno konteksto.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja fakultetui apsvarstyti, ar magistrantūros studijų lygmeniu dalykų ekspertai turėtų pristatyti integruotą teoriją, ar praktiką, sukauptą katedros; tai magistrantūros studijų programą labiau atskirtų nuo bakalauro studijų programos.
2. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja į studijų programą įtraukti daugiau bendrų, socialiai atsakingų ir kontekstinį mąstymą skatinančių projektų (visų dabartinių meno zonų). Tai galėtų turėti teigiamos įtakos studentams, jie būtų labiau socialiai atsakingi.
3. Ekspertų grupė taip pat rekomenduoja labiau atskirti bakalauro studijų programą nuo magistrantūros studijų programos.
4. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja akademijai labiau palaikyti Skulptūros katedrą ir pasitelkus ryšius su miesto savivaldybe padėti gauti leidimą meninei veiklai viešojoje erdvėje.
5. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja katedrai inicijuoti dalyką ar seminarą, kuriame dalyvautų socialiniai partneriai (pageidautina) ir kuriame būtų kalbama apie prašymo gauti finansavimą rašymą, prašymo gauti gyvenamąsias patalpas pildymą, projektinio pasiūlymo rašymą ir atliktų darbų aplanko pristatymą.
6. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja, kad magistrantūros studentai imtųsi organizatorių ar pranešėjų vaidmens studentų vadovaujamuose seminaruose, kuriuose studentai rengia esė arba pristato savo darbus.
7. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja katedrai apsvarstyti pagrindinės dėstytojų komandos lyčių pusiausvyrą, kai numatoma priimti naujų dėstytojų.
8. Ekspertų grupė sveikina VDA ir fakultetą įdiegus personalo profesinio tobulėjimo sistemą ir rekomenduoja akademijai toliau gerinti galimybes dėstytojams kreiptis dėl profesinio tobulėjimo finansavimo.
9. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja stebėti erdvių paskirstymą, atsižvelgiant į priimtųjų skaičių katedroje.

10. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja administracijai užtikrinti, kad biblioteka įsigydama naujų leidinių atsižvelgtų į katedros pageidavimus ir poreikius.
11. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja VDA administracijai ieškoti veiksmingesnių anoniminių apklausų formalaus grįžtamojo ryšio pateikimo būdų.
12. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja katedrai užtikrinti, kad visi studentai suprastų Studijų programos komiteto vaidmenį ir savo indėlį, kurį gali duoti.

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)