



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJŲ IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJOS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
MULTIMEDIJOS DIZAINAS
(*valstybinis kodas – 653W63002*)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF MULTIMEDIA DESIGN
(*state code - 653W63002*)
STUDY PROGRAMME

at VILNIUS COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY AND DESIGN

Experts' team:

1. **Dr. Annie Doona (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Mika Ritalahti,** *academic,*
3. **Dr. Peter Purg,** *academic,*
4. **David Quin,** *academic,*
5. **Vilma Samulionytė,** *representative of social partners',*
6. **Julija Paulauskaitė,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator -
Ms Natalja Bogdanova

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Multimedijos dizainas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	653W63002
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis	Fotografija ir medijos
Studijų programos rūšis	Koleginės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (3 metai)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	180
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Medijų meno profesinis bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2012 01 25

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Multimedia Design</i>
State code	653W63002
Study area	Arts
Study field	Photography and Media
Type of the study programme	College
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (3 year)
Volume of the study programme in credits	180
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Professional Bachelor of Media Art
Date of registration of the study programme	2012 01 25

© 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	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	5
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	15
2.6. Programme management	18
2.7. Examples of excellence	20
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	21
IV. SUMMARY	23
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	25

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2. General

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

No.	Name of the document
1.	safety rules
2.	rules of technical use
3.	methodological guidelines for final works

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

The Study programme Multimedia design has been developed from the previously running program Interactive design while updating it according to the EU structural funds and LR MES

funded measure “Improvement of Study Quality, Increasing of Internationality“, implementing the project “Improvement of Design and New Media Study Quality”. The updated study programme was evaluated in 2012 by the German agency EVALAG (Evaluations Agentur Baden Württemberg), enrolled in the European register of agencies for quality assurance in higher education . Independent experts positively evaluated the renewed study programme Multimedia Design and awarded it the certificate of the evaluation agency for quality assurance in higher education EVALAG, as well as the right to label the study programme EVALAG with a quality mark. With consideration to conclusions and recommendations of the experts, the specification of the study programme Multimedia to be implemented was prepared and it was submitted to the Centre for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (CQAHE) which accredited the programme as a new study programme (state code – 653W63002). Its implementation has been commenced since 1 September, 2012. The study programme was accredited until 30 June, 2015.

1.4. The Review Team

The Review Team was completed according *Description of experts’ recruitment*, approved by order No. 1-01-151 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 8th October, 2015.

1. **Dr. Annie Doona (team leader)**, *President of Dún Laoghaire Institute of Art, Design and Technology, Ireland.*
2. **Mika Ritalahti**, *Silva Mysterium Oy producer and managing director, Finland.*
3. **Dr. Peter Purg**, *professor of University of Nova Gorica, SQAA evaluator, Slovenia.*
4. **David Quin**, *lector of Dún Laoghaire Institute of Art, Design and Technology, Ireland.*
5. **Vilma Samulionytė**, *photographer, curator- project manager and secretary of board of Lithuanian Photographers Association, Lithuania.*
6. **Julija Paulauskaitė**, *student of Kaunas University of Technology study programme Philosophy of Media, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The Review Team agreed that the programme aims and learning outcomes were well defined, clear and publicly accessible. The programme aim (SER, p. 7) “To educate creative and innovative specialists meeting the needs of the dynamic labour market of creative industries; to prepare a creator of multimedia products capable of implementing in practice a

creative multimedia project prepared independently or by others, while working both, individually or in a team” is clear and well articulated, mentioning key components such as the education of creative and innovative specialists, the needs of a dynamic labour market, the preparation of a creator of multimedia products, individual work and team work. Programme staff (management and lecturing staff) and students have a strong understanding of learning outcomes. Learning outcomes, course aims and assessment are explained to students early, verbally and in written form and such explanations are repeated regularly, allowing students to concentrate on their learning within the programme.

Programme aims and learning outcomes are based on academic and professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the Lithuanian labour market. The learning outcomes of this programme are in conformity with the legal and other regulatory documents laying down academic and professional requirements for the qualification of prepared specialists. When renewing the study programme reference was made to these requirements laid down in the following legal acts and regulatory documents:

Order No. V-501 “On the specification of general requirements for the degree first cycle and integrated study programmes” of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania of 9 April 2010.

Order No. V-1190 of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania “On amending the Order No. V-501 “On the specification of general requirements for the degree first cycle and integrated study programmes” of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania of 9 April 2010” of 15 July 2010.

Order No. ISAK-1026 of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania “On approval of the specification of the full-time and part-time study mode” of 15 May 2009.

Order No. 1-01-162 “On approval of the methodology for assessing the ongoing study programmes” of the director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education” of 20 December 2010.

Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué /The Bologna Process 2020 – The European Higher Education Area in the new decade. Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve, 28-29 April 2009;

Europos aukštojo mokslo erdvės kvalifikacijų struktūra (Dublin descriptors)/ A framework for qualifications of the European Higher Education Area (2005). Bologna Working Group on Qualifications Frameworks.

Europos kreditų kaupimo ir perkėlimo sistemos vadovas/ECTS User Guide, 2009 (translation into the Lithuanian language).

Conclusions of the European Council regarding strategic framework for European cooperation in the field of education and science (EC 2020), 12 May 2009.

The objective and learning outcomes of the programme are in conformity with the requirements of legal acts prescribed for the first cycle of college studies. The complexity level of the learning outcomes meet the 6th level qualification requirements of the European Higher Education Area, European Qualifications Framework and the National Qualifications Framework. (These EQF and NQF relationships are detailed in Table 4, p. 11 of the SER).

The programme is fortunate that key industry stakeholders in the Vilnius area are readily accessible to the programme and keen to be involved. The programme already has commendably strong links with industry stakeholders, some of whom were regularly consulted during programme creation, during programme development, during the recent refit of the programme facilities and during the Self Evaluation Report (SER) preparation process. Stakeholders also commented favourably on the programme's flexible ability to adapt to the rapid changes in media and in the marketplace.

The programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualification offered. Students and alumni did express some regret that the programme was not of longer duration (4 years was their suggestion) and were disappointed that a college like VCTD was not in a position to award a higher (full BA Hons) qualification. Students and alumni pointed out that a longer programme would allow them time to focus more on their chosen specialisations within the area of multimedia design. This clearly demonstrated to the Review Team the commendable pedagogical ambition of the programme and an equally commendable student appetite for advanced learning.

The Review Team agreed that the name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered were compatible with each other. Once again, the Review Team agreed that the programme title 'Multimedia Design', its aims (which include "to educate creators of multimedia products"), the programme learning outcomes and the programme content were aligned to educate a successful graduate to full Professional Bachelors level in this particular discipline. Though this programme is very new, it is already well defined and is distinctively different from other courses in Lithuania. Paragraph 26, p. 12 of the SER asserts that the programme is the only first cycle programme of the professional bachelor's level in the field of Photography and Media (in the area of Art) in Lithuania aimed at providing students with complex education. During the first year of studies, students learn the fundamentals of media, before choosing a specialisation in year two and then joining together in teams in the final year to develop more complex projects. Stakeholders observed that graduates of this programme are competing directly not just with graduates from equivalent college

programmes but with graduates from Lithuanian university and academy programmes. In the meeting with the Review Team, one stakeholder said “I see no competition with other colleges? I’d compare these with university grads”. Another stakeholder asserted “This college or no college at all. We hire graphic designers from VAA. Other part from here or from international partners”. Student learning appears to be very strong. Effective and well-guided work placement opportunities during their studentship help towards excellent graduate employability.

2.2. Curriculum design

The Review Team is satisfied that the programme’s curriculum design meets legal requirements. Again, paragraph 18, p. 11 of the SER asserts that the learning outcomes are in conformity with the legal and other regulatory documents laying down academic and professional requirements for the qualification of prepared specialists. When renewing the programme reference was made to these requirements laid down in numerous legal acts and regulatory documents which have already been detailed above (on page 6 of this Report).

Study subjects and modules are spread evenly, are well sequenced, relevant and their themes are not repetitive. Students valued the broad learning opportunities afforded to them in the programme’s first year and did not feel that they were being asked to specialise too soon. The Programme Study Plan (Annex 6) shows clear evidence of a generally well sequenced programme, with clear basics being taught in stage one, specialisations offered in stage two and complex project opportunities presented to the students in stage three. In the interviews with the Review Team, one graduate argued “Best part was to try everything. Those who came here and didn’t know what they wanted found out what they wanted to do”.

One exception in clear sequencing related to academic (written) work. The Review Team reviewed a selection of final theses, these showed a general lack of academic rigour in the areas of applied methodology and bibliographical management. The Review Team suggests that academic research and writing skills should be developed and supported from year one, in a sequenced and iterative way, rather than left to year three of the programme. It is acknowledged that teachers informally encourage all students to ‘think about’ their final thesis and even to write it from year one, but very few students follow this advice.

The Review Team agreed that the content of the subjects and modules is broadly consistent with the type and level of the studies. This is a strong Professional Bachelor programme, with well-considered, well sequenced learning opportunities for students, strong awareness of the rapidly evolving media market and effective linkages to enthusiastic stakeholders. Students have good opportunities to work with up to date equipment, hardware and software, to participate in effective work placements and to work both individually and as part of

creative teams. Once again, the Review Team would encourage the early introduction and development of academic research and writing skills, which would assist students' critical thinking skills, creativity and learning, thereby assisting students even in their more practical assignments. However, students would also welcome the earlier introduction and development of soft skills – business skills, self-promotion, and self-management. Such soft skills are currently introduced in semester two of the final year – soft skills should be introduced and developed across a number of modules in years one and two.

The content and methods of the subjects and modules on this programme are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Students were content with the mixture of lecturer instruction, project work and practical assignments and placements. Students also valued the opportunity to regularly pitch and present their project work as part of their programme learning. Once again, The Review Team would strongly encourage the earlier introduction and development of soft skills. The Review Team observed that the programme's use of Moodle is at a very early stage, mostly used as a course materials repository (though teachers claimed to see big future potential for Moodle's e-register and e-diary). Lecturers described Moodle as 'bulky' and repeatedly bemoaned its inability to handle large files such as video. This apparent confusion is contributing to a (student and lecturer) migration from Moodle to platforms such as Google Docs and Facebook, which at times creates serious pedagogical communication breakdowns, especially when email is also used in parallel. All of these points to fundamental gaps in the programme team's understanding of Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) and the Review Team were deeply concerned that use of Moodle will wither and die in such an environment. Once again, the programme team need structured pedagogically based TEL training to understand when, how, and why Virtual Learning Environments (VLE) (like Moodle) are appropriate and when platforms like email, Facebook, Dropbox, Prezi, Google Docs, Twitter, Tumblr, Pinterest, Blogger are useful (and not) in education. The appropriate (and simple) use of TEL has enormous potential to enhance student learning, but the pedagogical potentials and downsides of technology (including when and when not to use technology) must be clearly understood. Lecturers and students must be clear on the official technological communication and learning pathways – students will use Facebook and Google docs anyhow but that does not mean that colleges should migrate 'official' communication with students onto such open, unprotected and less controllable platforms. The Review Team believes that the potential for such migration is clearly already present in VCTD Multimedia Design.

The Review Team is content that the scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes. Once again, the Review Team agreed that this programme was offering strong Professional Bachelor learning opportunities for its students and retained the flexibility

and agility to change and respond to changes in a rapidly evolving media market. The Review Team did feel that academic writing and research and the development of soft skills should all be introduced much earlier (see above).

The content of the programme reflects many of the latest achievements in science, art and technologies and stakeholders commended the programme on its eagerness to adapt to the rapidly changing media world and labour market. The programme's students and teachers would have greater understanding of the latest international trends if student and teacher mobility (outgoing and incoming) was increased, if the programme was involved in more projects with similar international higher education institutions and if more visiting lecturers were brought in on a regular basis to work (even for short courses) on the programme. Increased and sustained opportunities for students and staff to develop foreign language skills (especially English?) would greatly assist in such ongoing international initiatives – students mentioned that an English course is currently provided in 1st year only and the Head of Strategic Development Department said “On language skills, we provided English courses. I’m not sure it was a success, because of the motivation of the teachers”. The Review Team recognises that VCTD finances are limited, especially in support of outgoing mobility. An alternative might be to invest in attracting groups of students and lecturers from foreign institutions to VCTD for specific courses (especially if those specific courses were taught through English).

2.3. Teaching staff

The Review Team agreed that the study programme is provided by the staff meeting legal requirements. Paragraphs 40 and 41, p. 16 of the SER detail that staff for studies is (sic) formed in accordance with legal acts and other regulatory documents of the Republic of Lithuania. The qualification of lecturers working in the study programme conforms to the study field (Photography and Media) and is sufficient for achieving the programme objectives and learning outcomes. All lecturers have acquired the second Master's qualification degree or have a degree equivalent to the Master's qualification degree in different fields of science (social sciences, humanities and the arts). Competent and qualified lecturers, recognised artists with practical and pedagogical experience work in the study programme. A list of lecturers indicating their pedagogical and (or) scientific degree, experience in artistic, pedagogical work, the field of research interests, practical work experience in the area of the course taught are provided in volume 2 of the SER (Annex No.2). All lecturers have a second cycle (Master's) degree or a degree equivalent to Master's qualification degree from different scientific fields (01S, 07S, 02P, 09P, 04S, 05S, 07S, 03H), three of them – PhD degree, (2 in the area of social sciences, 1 – of humanities). Two lecturers take PhD studies, and all of them have at least three years'

professional experience. The Review Team agree that qualification of lecturers is appropriate and sufficient for implementing this study programme.

The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes.

The Review Team agree that the qualifications of teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes and are in conformity with Lithuanian and VTDK rules and regulations (detailed above). The artistic, professional and research activities of the programme teachers are detailed on p. 16 and 17 of the SER, as well as in the teachers' CVs (Annex 3). However, the Review Team did note that more formalised, regular opportunities for the pedagogical development of teachers are extremely limited in this programme. Whilst much work has been done with teachers on programme development, learning outcomes and ECTS etc. (this is obvious even in the high quality of the SER and programme documentation), the Review Team strongly believes that the programme team now requires help to develop in areas such as technology enhanced learning and modern, alternative modes of teaching, learning and assessment and even in some of the more theoretical aspects of teaching, learning and assessment. Such structured pedagogical development will remain very limited in effect if very short courses, seminars and short international trips are the only pedagogically-based staff training and development opportunities afforded to Multimedia Design teachers. Strategically planned and rigorous development of teaching, learning and assessment will benefit students and teachers and will greatly enhance the ongoing development of this already strong programme. The sustained development of foreign language skills would also assist lecturer mobility (incoming and outgoing), which would assist lecturer professional development as the programme learning outcomes are evolved, developed and refined.

The number of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure learning outcomes, although the Review Team did note that many of the teaching staff were part-time. Paragraph 59, p. 19 of the SER asserts that the number of lecturers is sufficient for achieving the projected learning outcomes. The ratio between the number of the programme lecturers and studying students is provided in Table 9 (SER, p. 19). Paragraph 61, p. 20 asserts that the pedagogical workload of lecturers is regulated by legal acts of the Republic of Lithuania, Recommendations of the Ministry of Science and Education - Order No. V-2538 "Recommendations on the duration of working time of higher school lecturers and the workload structure" of the Ministry of Education and Science of 23.12.2011. Whilst the use of part-timers presents an opportunity in terms of ability to flexibly adapt and change the programme and the specific subjects covered, especially as new technological trends emerge and dissipate, the downside is that the programme lecturing team can often become less stable (especially as part-time staff leave to work on external projects, to be replaced by even less pedagogically experienced part-time staff). It is also almost

impossible for a HEI to pedagogically train most part-time staff, which throws the responsibility for their pedagogical performance and development onto already fully preoccupied fulltime teaching staff. Such an arrangement is rarely sustainable, especially when it's conducted in an informal and ad hoc basis. In their discussion with the Review Team one part-time teacher asserted "we don't need new qualifications. We talk.". This reveals a lack of understanding of teaching, learning and assessment and the need for ongoing professional (pedagogical) development. The danger for any programme is that the acceptance of such an approach on the part of teachers can rapidly reduce all pedagogy down to mere 'information transfer' offering relatively shallow teaching and learning, rather than the creation of deep learning opportunities for all students.

Teaching staff turnover is able to ensure an adequate provision of this programme; although the Review Team had some concerns about a certain reliance on part-time staff (see point above). Students also referred to lecturer illness impacting on their learning. This might point to inadequate cover for lecturer illness.

The Review Team agrees that the HEI creates adequate conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme. However, if student learning is to continue to develop, if the programme is to continue to improve, if programme outcomes are to be preserved and enhanced and if lecturers are to cope adequately with ongoing changes in both the media and educational worlds, then the planned and systematic development of teachers' pedagogical skills must become a priority for the programme and the college.

The Review Team agree that the teaching staff of the programme are involved in research (art and media) directly related to the programme. Programme lecturers are commendably producing feature-length animations, running leading studios and participating in professional media seminars and exhibitions. Part-time lecturers on the programme are commendably involved in the Lithuanian new media and multimedia (design) marketplace.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The Review Team agrees that the premises for studies are excellent both in their size and quality. The programme is fortunate to be based in fully refurbished building, with state of the art studios, workshops, libraries, animation facilities, exhibition spaces and teaching spaces. The students' main concerns relate to early closing times, no weekend opening and problems with the booking of and access to the inventory of equipment. Students point out that the facility's early closing time (20.00 each weekday and only open at the weekend in the one

week before final deadline on the Major Project). Consideration might be given to extending daily opening times and some weekend opening.

The Review Team did explain minor concerns about the air quality in the new buildings – even on a relatively cool autumn day, air circulation in many of the college spaces seemed very limited. Review Team members expressed concerns that with all windows closed for the winter months and with heating full on, studio, workshop and lecture spaces might quickly become unbearable. Students were asked by Review Team about fire drills and evacuation practices in the college building. Students responded in extremely vague terms, clearly suggesting that fire drills did not regularly take place and evacuation routes and procedures were not clear to them. This needs to be urgently addressed. In the interests of effective health and safety practices fire and evacuation drills should be factored into the annual calendar.

The Review Team is satisfied that the teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are adequate both in size and quality. Even with new equipment now available, students' argued that they could have even **more** equipment. The Review Team believes that a strategy for supporting, maintaining, supplementing and developing the equipment and facilities will need to be developed, implemented and monitored, including a clear plan to access regular college funding to maintain and supplement the equipment inventory. On the booking of equipment, students complained that equipment was difficult to book out "you have to carefully book it out". The use of the college equipment was also heavily conditional – students complained that equipment could only be used in and around the college campus, for a single day at a time, otherwise "a tutor would have to go with you". Clear booking and usage procedures need to be developed, adopted, implemented and monitored and off-campus insurance will need to be either clarified or adopted. This is not a very problematic observation on the part of the Review Team – sustainability and maintenance of newly acquired equipment, hardware and software presents a challenge for any higher education institution, especially when such equipment, hardware and software has largely been acquired using structural funds. The challenge now for this programme is to find regular, sustainable college funding to keep hardware and software levels at adequate levels.

The Review Team agrees that the higher education institution has adequate arrangements for students' practice – the students are encouraged to use their own initiative in order to organise appropriate placements, but lecturers will (and do) assist in their placement efforts if required. Both the programme and the students are fortunate that a lot of high-quality stakeholders are concentrated in the Vilnius area. Stakeholders valued the opportunity to permit student placement and were eager to engage more with the programme in order to coordinate and plan such placement activity in the future. Students saw their practice placements as being some

of their most valuable learning on the programme. The Review Team do believe however that written guidelines and short policies on external working and work placement should and could now be developed by programme team, students, alumni and external stakeholders, perhaps starting as modest open discussion documents. The Head of Media Department pointed this out in the interviews with the Review Team “maybe the problem is that we have collaboration and cooperation with the social partners they’re not accidental, but they’re not regular. Business don’t see that they have to be involved in higher education.”. The Review Team agrees that contacts with stakeholders does now need to be ‘regularised’. Written guidelines and short policies might address issues like: 1.Appropriate durations for practice placements; 2.Descriptions and definitions of practice placements, internships, traineeships; 3.Why and when work (even student work) for stakeholders should be unpaid and when it should be paid (however modestly); 4.What students could and should be learning on practice placements – and how might such learning be facilitated or enhanced by a stakeholder.

Greater cooperation with stakeholders would also ‘fit’ practice placements better into the programme timetable and into stakeholders’ busy schedules. In interviews, students were enthusiastic about practice placements but were completely unclear about many of the issues above. The Review Team believes that this is part of the functional development of the students’ soft skills as they work through the programme, towards professional practice. Stakeholders were similarly enthusiastic about involving students in their outside enterprises, but relationships between the college, the programme and stakeholders would benefit from the introduction of simple guidelines and formal written agreements.

The Review Team also believes that the programme team should also consider the development of some short guidelines on external project work and linkages (again, in collaboration with students, alumni and stakeholders), especially because approaches from such external projects will increase dramatically as the reputation of the programme, the students and the alumni becomes increasingly high-profile in Vilnius and in Lithuania. Not every ‘competition’ or external project will provide valuable learning opportunities for students. Some stakeholders (wealthy holders of vast IP catalogues for example) were already using students to make videos about piracy, IP and copyright protection – it was unclear whether the stakeholder had paid anything towards the production or creation of such work. Otherwise, such projects could be seen as addressing one problematic issue (IP protection and copyright) by creating another problematic issue – using students (unpaid work and direct competition between the HEI and commercial production companies). Many project approaches will simply be inappropriate attempts to use students on real production work for free. Other projects (especially more commercial projects) might more correctly be referred instead to stakeholder studios in Vilnius

or to recent graduates who are in the marketplace, depending on such commercial work. The Review Team would suggest that projects for NGOs, charities, other educational institutions and projects involving modest research, experimental components and other students are often most appropriate for undergraduate students. The provision of modest funding from stakeholders should be encouraged – especially from agencies with budgets. Any funding coming into the college needs to be carefully and transparently handled and modestly (and transparently) disseminated to the students working on the projects. Exposure to and understanding of such ongoing project and budget management (even on small projects) can afford enormously beneficial opportunities for student learning and the development of their business soft skills.

In their discussion with the Review Team, teachers suggested that a solution to some of these difficulties was to establish a working studio within the college. “We need to establish here an educational studio. All these technologies need to be organised in one studio, here.” The Review Team were not at all convinced by such a potentially old-fashioned, centralised concept, especially when external stakeholders in Vilnius are keen to work even more with the programme, and with its students and alumni. Stakeholders in Vilnius appear to be working at the cutting edge of multimedia technology and will have far more flexibility and agility than the VCTD to move quickly with new technology trends as those trends emerge (and dissipate) in the future. The Review Team suggests that in 2015 bridging Incubation Units, Start Up Labs or Media Labs (like the current ‘Hacklab’) would be a more usual, modern and familiar idea – not a single monolithic ‘educational studio’.

The Review Team agreed that teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) for the programme were both adequate and accessible. The two libraries (one specifically dedicated to Design students) seemed well provisioned and well stocked. Whilst the library provided good facilities (electrical power and Wi-Fi) for student laptops on the BYOD principle (Bring Your Own Device), the library might consider the provision of more pcs in the library for students who did not own, or cannot afford a laptop (or broadband access where they live). Student poverty is an issue everywhere and discrete provision of more, simpler and freely accessible computer equipment and Wi-Fi is to be encouraged everywhere.

2.5. Study process and students’ performance assessment

The Review Team agreed that the admission requirements for this programme were well-founded. Admissions procedures for this programme are detailed in paragraphs 81, 82 and 83 on p. 26 and 27 of the SER. The Law on Science and Studies regulates the procedure and funding of the admission of students to higher schools. Students are enrolled in the study

programme pursuant to the rules of students' admission that are published each year at the order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania. Until 2009, the college conducted the admission to the study programme. Currently students are admitted to full-time studies through the college's participation in the procedure for general admission to Lithuanian higher schools: admission is organised and implemented, and the sequencing of persons who completed a secondary education programme with the best grades is drawn up by the Association Lithuanian Higher Education Schools for organising general admission, in accordance with the authority granted to it by the Minister of Education and Science. Admission is carried out according to the Description of the procedure for the organisation and implementation of general entrance examinations to study programmes in the area of college art studies and art pedagogy.

The most important screening criteria for the admission of students are the assessments of the entrance examination and two graduation examinations, or the annual grades recalculated accordingly (except for the course of the Lithuanian Language and Literature). The main screening criteria for the programme are the following ones: an assessment of the entrance examination (weighting – 0.7); assessment of the graduation examination in the second course: History/Foreign Language/Information Technologies /Mathematics /Biology (weighting – 0.1); assessment of the graduation examination in the third course – Lithuanian Language and Literature (weighting – 0.2). No additional screening criteria are applied to the field of art studies. The number of students admitted to state-funded places is regulated by the Ministry of Education and Science; the number of non-state funded places – unlimited. Table 12 on SER p. 27 provides competition point averages of students admitted to full-time studies.

The Review Team also agreed that the organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. The programme is relatively new, but is already functioning well. The programme is reviewed regularly (by programme team and by Study Programme Committee). Mechanisms for the gathering of student feedback and the utilisation of that feedback for improvement and development of the programme seem to be effective, although the students' understanding of Quality Assurance and their key role in QA does need to be developed. The programme has just had its first crop of graduates – active steps need to be taken to encourage alumni association and to annually gather data from alumni (especially in relation to ongoing employability). Alumni should be a valuable resource in the future development of this programme.

The Review Team agrees that students are encouraged to participate in research, artistic and applied research activities, through their programme project work, through practice placements and into their final thesis and major project. However, the Review Team

would encourage the programme's early introduction and development of academic research and writing skills, which would assist students' 'research mindedness', critical thinking skills, creativity and learning, thereby assisting students even in their more practical assignments. The Review Team did note a disappointing similarity in the major work presented (many of the final projects seemed to be following a very tight brief, based on a standard template – quite unusual (and somewhat inappropriate) for final project work at this level. The Review Team firmly believe that final year students on this programme could and should be doing more interesting, research based, well produced, individualistic final work, which would represent them much more effectively in the outside world. The Review Team was also surprised that the preparation of a Portfolio/Showreel didn't seem to be a formal requirement for each final year student, though both students, alumni and employers agreed such a portfolio was 'standard' in real-life, and that every graduate has one (or needs one). The Review Team were disappointed to discover that some dissertations were short and didn't seem to strictly conform to thesis guidelines in relation to word/page count, and in relation to the quality and rigour of the academic argument, referencing and bibliography. The programme presented written guidelines governing the thesis and final work. The Review Team would suggest that these guidelines are rigorously enforced. The Review Team would encourage the programme team to be more academically ambitious for its final year students, in both the major project and the thesis.

The Review Team agreed that students were presented with adequate opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes. In the meeting between the Review Team and VCTD Management, the Head of Strategic Development Department pointed out that “the appetite for mobility on the Multimedia Design programme comes from both students and lecturers”. However, students did comment on the usual difficulties with discovering matching Erasmus programmes and concerns about ‘missing credits and courses’ whilst away on Erasmus placements. In the meeting with the Review Team, one 2nd year student said “My personal reason is it's really hard to find a match with courses abroad, with the same credits etc? I might miss the classes back here in Lithuania.” This is a difficulty everywhere and can only be addressed by continuously increasing the number of Erasmus agreements and other formal linkages with international HEIs, as well as promoting flexibility of foreign ECTS credit acceptance among course leaders, and the ECTS coordinators.

The Review Team agreed that the higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support. A psychology lecturer is qualified as a counsellor and is available for students in difficulty. Student performance is closely monitored by the programme team and, when students are struggling academically reasonable accommodations are made and extensions are negotiated.

The Review Team agrees that the assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available. Assessment was explained to students from early in their studentship, both verbally and in written form and such explanations were regularly followed up and repeated. Students were happy that their understanding of assessment was strong. As the programme develops however, increased modern pedagogical training for the programme's teaching staff would allow for more modern methods of assessment – especially formative assessment and assessment for learning (rather than mere assessment of learning).

The Review Team are content that the professional activities of the majority of graduates meet the programme providers' expectations. Once again, Multimedia Design is a new programme which has just had its first crop of graduates, so it is impossible to generalise at this point. Graduates did suggest to the Review Team that the earlier introduction of business and professional soft skills would help future graduates in their approaches towards professional practice and the marketplace. Active steps do need to be taken by the programme to facilitate or encourage alumni association and to annually gather data from stakeholders and alumni (especially in relation to ongoing employability and market trends). Alumni should be a valuable resource in the future development of this programme and even existing stakeholders on this programme are eager to be involved more systematically in relation to programme development, planning, project work and student practice placement.

2.6. Programme management

The Review Team concluded that responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated and management structures and procedures were well established and functioning well. All VCTD senior management saw themselves having clearly defined roles and responsibilities in relation to the programme and all management met by the Review Team (from the VCTD Director, to the Vice Director, Senior Accountant, Head of Strategic Development Committee, Head of Quality Department, Chairman of Design Faculty Council and Dean of Design Faculty, Head of Media Department and others) were involved in programme related decision making.

The Review Team agreed that information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed. Despite excellent student participation in the regular student surveys (60% to 70% participation was claimed by management) and despite the fact that the Study Programme Committee appeared to be working effectively, students seemed rather lethargic and unmotivated about their representation. In meetings with the Review Team, both students and administration staff admitted that student representatives in various meetings such as Study Programme Committee and Round Tables tend to be selected from

already active students and not much effort is made to activate students who are perceived as 'less active'. One suggestion would be to allow students to select their representatives democratically. The Review Team noted that communication with students was overly based on informal routes and should be formalised to ensure equal access and to avoid over reliance on 'active' students. The conclusion of the Review Team was that communication between students and admin is good but communication between admin and students needs improvement.

The Review Team agrees that the outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme. The SER clearly shows (Table 18, p. 36 and 37) findings from the 2012 EVALAG evaluation of the programme and the changes made to the programme in response to the evaluation recommendations.

The Review Team agrees that the evaluation and improvement processes do involve stakeholders. Initial programme development and the preparation of the SER all directly involved stakeholders – not just questionnaires and data collection, but invites to some stakeholders to come into the college: “I visited the facilities, had round table discussions. I was many times in the college, met with students, did my notes etc.” Meaningful and sustained engagement with stakeholders is an ongoing challenge for HEIs around the world. In the SER Group discussion with the Review Team the Head of Media Department said: “Business don't see that they have to be involved in higher education”. The SER identifies the current network of stakeholders as too 'narrow'. In Actions for Improvement (SER, p. 11) it states “It is planned to develop a network of stakeholders by involving into the study process not only enterprises in Vilnius city, but also to look for contacts with foreign companies.” The Review Team would suggest that links with current stakeholders, from the Vilnius area, who are already eager to be involved more in the work of the programme should be better organized and formalized first, before the programme casts its stakeholder net wider.

The Review Team recognises that the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient. Once again, senior management, programme team, students and stakeholders all seem involved in the maintenance of quality assurance on the programme, although p.37 of the SER states “Seeking to improve the implementation of the study programme, it is necessary to use the implemented quality management system in a more efficient way”. Such increased efficiencies are to be encouraged. This is a good, new programme and the day to day functioning of the programme is obviously still a work in progress.

2.7. Examples of excellence

The Review Team would point out that the newly refurbished college building and facilities should be classed as excellent and VCTD should be commended for organising such an excellent provision.

In discussions with the Review Team, stakeholders observed that graduates from this programme are already competing favourably in the marketplace with graduates from universities and academies. Stakeholders believed that the quality of VCTD graduates was far higher than the quality of graduates from equivalent colleges in Lithuania. Whilst recognising that the *Multimedia Design* programme is new, the first crop of graduates have just emerged and it is thus impossible to broadly generalise, graduate success and employability already points towards a commendable position of excellence.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **The Review Team recommends the earlier introduction and development of business and professional soft skills** (including business skills, self-promotion, and self-management) on the programme. Such skills can and should be introduced from year one, especially through student involvement in appropriate external projects, with appropriate stakeholders. External project work should be guided by guidelines and policies developed between VCTD, the programme team, students, alumni and stakeholders.
2. **The Review Team recommends the sustained development of foreign language skills to include English.** This will assist student and lecturer mobility (incoming and outgoing), and will help with lecturer professional development and the ongoing development of the programme, ensuring that the programme reflects the very latest achievements in science, art and technologies.
3. **The Review Team recommends that academic research and writing skills should be developed and supported from year one**, in a sequenced and iterative way (shorter essays, academic projects and papers developed from the start of the programme, building in scope and scale through the years of the study programme towards the ultimate thesis), rather than left to year three of the programme (when the students are currently asked to produce their final thesis).
4. **The Review Team strongly recommends that the programme lecturers and students must be clear on official technological communication and learning pathways.** The programme team need structured pedagogically based Technology Enhanced Learning training to understand when, how, and why Virtual Learning Environments (such as Moodle) are appropriate and when platforms like email, Facebook, Dropbox, Prezi, Google Docs, Twitter, Tumblr, Pinterest, Blogger are useful (and not useful) in education.
5. **The Review Team recommends that the programme team now requires structured pedagogical training** to develop in areas such as technology enhanced learning, modern, alternative modes of teaching, learning and assessment and some of the more theoretical aspects of teaching, learning and assessment. Such structured pedagogical development will remain limited if very short courses, seminars and short international trips are the only pedagogically-based staff training and development opportunities afforded to Multimedia Design teachers. Strategically planned and rigorous development of teaching, learning and assessment will benefit students and teachers and will greatly enhance the ongoing development of this already strong programme.

6. **The Review Team believes that a strategy for supporting, maintaining, supplementing and developing the equipment and facilities will need to be developed, implemented and monitored**, including a clear plan to access regular college funding to maintain and supplement the excellent equipment inventory.
7. **The Review Team would suggest that guidelines for final thesis are rigorously enforced**. The Review Team believe that the programme should be more academically ambitious for its final year students, both in the major project and in the ambition of the theses.
8. **The Review Team strongly recommends that stakeholders involved more in the programme, systematically, strategically and sustainably**.
9. **The Review Team commends the excellent college building and facilities, but recommends that access to facilities should be extended** in weekday evenings and at weekends through the academic year. Student booking of equipment needs to be simpler, more transparent and more efficient and more senior students (3rd years for example) need to be able to use college equipment off the college campus, without tutor supervision in the pursuit of their academic project work.

IV. SUMMARY

The process of self-evaluation was strong with good involvement from a range of partners; the SER is a good document. Overall, this is a very good program that is much needed and important and the Review Team would encourage the continued development and quality enhancement of this program. In general, students and alumni are satisfied with the overall program and with the range and standard of facilities.

The Review Team discussed the overall breadth of the program. Students and alumni are supportive of the breadth and range of skills and knowledge acquired. Students would however welcome further development of a range of soft skills to include time management, self-promotion, and project management. The Review Team is of the view that the development of language skills English and others would be important.

The Review Team noted the lack of academic writing skills and research methodologies in other than Year 3 of the programme; earlier introduction of these skills would aid preparation for the final thesis and add to the overall quality of the program.

Communication between staff and students appears to be based on a variety of platforms, some informal and some formal, which may be confusing for students. The program needs to make clearer the official channels of communication between staff and students.

The Review Team note and commend the aspirations for growth of the program. The program would benefit from more strategic action planning and prioritizing at management level; this is particularly important in relation to the sustainability of physical resources, human resources and technical support.

Staff appear well qualified, well-motivated and enthusiastic. Staff development of lecturing staff around a range of pedagogical issues could be developed in a systematic manner across the programme.

The programme has excellent teaching and learning facilities and physical resources, and students appear to have good access to them. A strategy for sustaining and maintain the equipment out of college funds may need to be developed.

The Review Team viewed a number of final theses and noted that although thesis guidelines were produced and disseminated in relation to the length of content, bibliographies etc. these were not always strictly adhered to.

Assessment methods were varied and appropriate. The schedule of assessments needs to be reviewed to ensure that overload of assessment at particular points in the year is avoided.

Administrative communication between students and the college is generally good. The Review Team noted that communication with students may however be overly based on informal

routes and should be formalized to ensure equal access and avoidance of over reliance on active students. Student surveys appear to be working well with very good participation rates.

The Review Team noted the employment following graduation is strong.

Social partners were very supportive of the programme and would welcome further involvement in the development of the programme. Communication with social partners does however appear to be based on individual contacts and would benefit from being more formalized. The program would benefit from more formal contact with key partners in the cultural industries.

The Review Team noted the international aspiration of the programme and the Erasmus scheme and would encourage further development of this.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Multimedia design* (state code – 653W63002) at Vilnius College of Technologies and Design 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	4
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	19

*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:

Annie Doona

Grupės nariai:

Team members:

Peter Purg

David Quin

Mika Ritalahti

Vilma Samulionytė

Julija Paulauskaitė

**VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJŲ IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJOS
PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *MULTIMEDIJOS DIZAINAS*
(VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 653W63002) 2015-12-31 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO
IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-384 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Vilniaus technologijų ir dizaino kolegijos studijų programa *Multimedijos dizainas* (valstybinis kodas – 653W63002) 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	4
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	19

* 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

Savianalizės procesas vyko sklandžiai, jame dalyvavo daug įvairių partnerių; savianalizės suvestinė yra gerai parengtas dokumentas. Apskritai studijų programa *Multimedijos dizainas* yra labai gera, labai reikalinga ir svarbi, todėl vertinimo grupė norėtų paraginti toliau ją plėtoti ir gerinti jos kokybę. Studentai ir alumnai iš esmės yra patenkinti visa programa ir priemonių apimtimi bei standartais.

Vertinimo grupė aptarė visus šios studijų programos aspektus. Studentai ir alumnai įgyja daug įvairių gebėjimų ir žinių. Tačiau studentai pageidautų, kad toliau būtų ugdomi profesiniai ir socialiniai gebėjimai, įskaitant mokėjimą valdyti laiką, reklamuotis ir valdyti projektus. Vertinimo grupė mano, kad būtų svarbu gerinti kalbų (anglų ir kitų) įgūdžius.

Vertinimo grupė pastebėjo, kad, išskyrus trečiuosius šios studijų programos įgyvendinimo metus, nelavinami akademinio rašymo įgūdžiai ir nedėstoma mokslinių tyrimų

metodika; jei šie įgūdžiai studentams būtų diegiami anksčiau, jiems būtų lengviau pasirengti baigiamiesiems darbams ir pagerėtų bendra programos kokybė.

Dėstytojų ir studentų bendravimas, atrodo, yra pagrįstas įvairiomis platformomis, kurių vienos yra oficialios, kitos – neoficialios, ir studentams tai gali būti painu. Reikėtų aiškiau nustatyti šios programos dėstytojų ir studentų oficialius ryšių kanalus.

Vertinimo grupė gerai vertina siekį plėtoti šią programą. Programai būtų naudingas labiau strateginis veiksmų planavimas ir prioritetų nustatymas vadybos lygmeniu; tai ypač svarbu turint omenyje fizinius ir žmogiškuosius išteklius bei techninę pagalbą.

Dėstytojai, atrodo, yra kompetentingi, motyvuoti ir entuziastingi. Vertinimo grupė pažymi, kad galėtų būti sistemingai vykdoma dėstytojų tobulinimo įvairiais pedagoginiais klausimais programa.

Šiai studijų programai skirtos mokymo ir mokymosi priemonės ir fiziniai ištekliai yra puikūs, atrodo, kad studentams jie yra lengvai prieinami. Galbūt reikėtų parengti įrangos palaikymo ir priežiūros iš kolegijos lėšų strategiją.

Vertinimo grupė išnagrinėjo tam tikrą skaičių baigiamųjų darbų ir projektų ir pastebėjo, kad, nors baigiamųjų darbų gairės dėl turinio apimties, bibliografijos ir t. t. buvo parengtos ir išplatintos, ne visada jų buvo laikomasi.

Vertinimo metodai buvo įvairūs ir tinkami. Vertinimo tvarkaraštis turi būti patikslintas, siekiant užtikrinti, kad būtų išvengta pernelyg didelio vertinimo krūvio tam tikrais metų laikotarpiais.

Studentų ir kolegijos bendravimas administraciniu lygmeniu iš esmės geras. Tačiau vertinimo grupė pastebėjo, kad ryšiai su studentais gali būti per daug pagrįsti neformaliais kanalais, taigi turi būti formalizuoti, siekiant užtikrinti vienodas galimybes jais naudotis ir išvengti per didelio pasiklivimo aktyviais studentais. Studentų apklausos, atrodo, organizuojamos tinkamai, jose dalyvauja labai daug studentų.

Vertinimo grupė pastebėjo, kad absolventų įsidarbinamumo lygis aukštas.

Socialiniai partneriai labai palaikė programą; jie norėtų ir toliau dalyvauti jos tobulinimo procese. Atrodo, kad bendravimas su socialiniais partneriais iš esmės pagrįstas asmeniniais ryšiais, būtų geriau juos formalizuoti. Programai būtų naudinga, jei būtų užmegzti oficialūs ryšiai su pagrindiniais kultūrinės industrijos partneriais.

Vertinimo grupė atkreipė dėmesį į tarptautinius šios programos ir *Erasmus* schemas siekius ir ragintų toliau juos plėtoti.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. **Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja, kad įgyvendinant studijų programą *Multimedijos dizainas* būtų anksčiau pradėta ugdyti profesinius ir socialinius gebėjimus (įskaitant verslo įgūdžius, savireklamą ir savivaldą).** Šie gebėjimai gali ir turėtų būti diegiami nuo pirmųjų studijų metų, ypač įtraukiant studentus į atitinkamus išorinius projektus, vykdomus kartu su socialiniais dalininkais. Išoriniai projektai turėtų būti atliekami vadovaujantis Vilniaus technologijų ir dizaino kolegijos (VTDK), studijų programos grupės, studentų, alumnų ir socialinių dalininkų kartu parengtomis gairėmis ir politika.
2. **Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja nepertraukiamai gerinti užsienio kalbų (įskaitant anglų kalbą) įgūdžius.** Tai paskatins studentų ir dėstytojų judumą (išvykimą ir atvykimą) ir dėstytojų profesinį tobulėjimą, nuolatinį studijų programos *Multimedijos dizainas* tobulinimą, o programoje užtikrintai atsispindės naujausi mokslo, meno ir technologijų pasiekimai.
3. **Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja, kad su akademiniais mokslinių tyrimų atlikimo ir (mokslinių tekstų) rašymo gebėjimai verčiau būtų ugdomi ir stiprinami nuo pirmųjų šios programos studijų metų,** nuosekliai ir pasikartojančiai (trumpesni rašiniai, akademiniai projektai ir straipsniai rengiami nuo studijų programos pradžios ir kiekvienais studijų metais didinama jų apimtis bei mastas iki baigiamojo darbo rengimo), nei paliekami tretiesiems metams (kai šiuo metu studentai turi pateikti baigiamuosius darbus).
4. **Vertinimo grupė primygtinai rekomenduoja, kad šios studijų programos dėstytojai ir studentai aiškiai žinotų oficialius technologinių ryšių ir mokymosi būdus.** Studijų programos grupei reikia turėti struktūrinių, pedagoginių technologijomis grindžiamo mokymo srities žinių, kad suprastų, kada, kaip ir kodėl virtuali mokymosi aplinka (pvz., *Moodle*) tinka ir kada yra naudinga (ir nenaudinga) naudotis, pavyzdžiui, šiomis priemonėmis: el. paštu, „Facebook“, „Dropbox“, „Prezi“, „Google Docs“, „Twitter“, „Tumblr“, „Pinterest“, „Blogger“.
5. **Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja, kad programos grupei dabar būtų suteiktas struktūrinis pedagoginis mokymas,** kad ji tobulėtų šiose srityse: technologijomis grindžiamas mokymas, šiuolaikiniai alternatyvūs mokymo, mokymosi ir vertinimo būdai ir kai kurie daugiau teoriniai mokymo, mokymosi ir vertinimo aspektai. Šis struktūrinis pedagoginis tobulėjimas išliks ribotas, jei vienintelė studijų programos *Multimedijų dizainas* dėstytojų pedagoginio mokymo ir tobulinimo galimybė bus labai trumpi kursai, seminarai ir trumpos kelionės į užsienį. Strategiškai suplanuotas ir tikslus mokymo, mokymosi ir vertinimo tobulinimas bus naudingas studentams ir dėstytojams, jis labai sustiprins šią ir taip jau stiprią programą.

6. **Vertinimo grupė mano, kad reikės parengti, įgyvendinti ir kontroliuoti įrangos bei priemonių (materialiųjų išteklių) rėmimo, išsaugojimo, papildymo ir tobulinimo strategiją**, įskaitant aiškų planą, kaip kolegijai gauti nuolatinį finansavimą, kad būtų galima prižiūrėti ir papildyti įrangą, siekiant, kad ji būtų puiki.
7. **Vertinimo grupė patartų užtikrinti, kad būtų griežtai laikomasi nurodymų dėl baigiamųjų darbų rengimo.** Vertinimo grupė mano, kad šioje studijų programoje turėtų būti keliami didesni reikalavimai paskutiniųjų metų studentams, turint omenyje jų kūrybiškumą ir akademinį siekius, susijusius su pagrindiniu projektu ir baigiamuoju darbu.
8. **Vertinimo grupė primygtinai rekomenduoja, kad į programą būtų sistemingai, strategiškai ir nuosekliai įtraukiami socialiniai dalininkai.**
9. **Vertinimo grupei patinka puikus kolegijos pastatas ir įrangą, tačiau ekspertai rekomenduoja suteikti galimybę naudotis priemonėmis ir šiokeadienių vakarais, ir savaitgaliais, išstisus mokslo metus.** Reikia supaprastinti įrangos užsakymo tvarką, padaryti ją skaidresnę ir veiksmingesnę; vyresnių kursų studentams (pvz., trečiakursiams) reikia suteikti galimybę kolegijos įrangą naudotis ir ne kolegijoje, netaikant jiems specialios vadovo priežiūros nuomojant iš kolegijos įrangą akademiniam projektui atlikti.

<...>

2.7. Išskirtinės kokybės pavyzdžiai

Vertinimo grupė norėtų pažymėti, kad atnaujintą kolegijos pastatą ir įrangą reikėtų priskirti aukščiausiai klasei, o VTDK reikėtų pagirti už tai, kad visa tai organizavo.

Kalbėdamiesi su vertinimo grupės nariais socialiniai dalininkai pastebėjo, kad studijų programos *Multimedijos dizainas* absolventai jau sėkmingai konkuruoja rinkoje su universitetų ir akademijų absolventais. Socialiniai dalininkai mano, kad VTDK absolventų kompetencija yra daug didesnė nei panašių Lietuvos kolegijų absolventų kompetencija. Pripažįstant, kad ši studijų programa yra nauja ir ką tik atsirado pirmieji jos absolventai, plačių apibendrinimų daryti neįmanoma, bet absolventų sėkmė ir įsidarbinamumas jau atspindi pagirtiną padėtį.

<...>

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)