



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS VAIDYBA
(*valstybinis kodas – 612W40003*)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF ACTING (*state code – 612W40003*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Vytautas Magnus University

Experts' team:

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

Evaluation coordinator – Ms Eimantė Gečytė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2015

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Vaidyba</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612W40003
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis	Teatras ir kinas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Teatro ir kino bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2012-03-20, Įsakymo Nr. SV6-11

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Acting</i>
State code	612W40003
Study area	Art studies
Study field	Theatre and film
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	first
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Theatre and film
Date of registration of the study programme	2012-03-20, Order No. SV6-11

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	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	11
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment	12
2.6. Programme management	14
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	17
IV. SUMMARY	18
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	20

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2. General

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

No.	Name of the document

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

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

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

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

The basis for the evaluation of the study programme is the Self-Evaluation Report (SER), prepared in 2014, its annexes and the site visit of the expert group to the University on 14th April 2015.

The visit incorporated all required meetings with different groups: the appropriate administrative staff, staff responsible for preparing the self-evaluation documents, teaching staff, students of all years of study (there are no graduates yet) and stakeholders. The expert group evaluated various support services (classrooms, studios, library, computer facilities), examined students' examination materials, term papers, and various other materials. After the expert group discussions and additional preparations of conclusions and remarks, introductory general conclusions of the visit were presented. After the visit, the group met to discuss and agree the content of the report, which represents the expert team's consensual views.

Vytautas Magnus University has 10 faculties (Arts, Catholic Theology, Economics and Management, Humanities, Informatics, Law, Natural Sciences, Political Science and Diplomacy, Social Sciences, Music Academy), including 41 department, 2 institutes, 18 study and research centres, 4 laboratories, Psychology Clinic, Kaunas Botanical Garden. There are 5 non-academic University centres and 4 institutes, Theatre, Arts Centre and Art Gallery "101", and other non-academic divisions. Administrative and maintenance services consist of 13 offices, Library, Publishing House and Archive.

The first cycle Acting study programme was started in 2012 and is implemented by the Contemporary Arts Department in the Faculty of Arts with a collaborative agreement with the Theatre Studies Department.

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 *14th April 2015*.

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

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

This is a very new programme (launched in 2012), which positions itself as unique or ‘exceptional’ (p.3 of SER) in the context of other acting programmes in Lithuania. Its uniqueness is evidenced by its contemporaneity, its *ambitions* for multi-disciplinarity and its adoption of the Artes Liberales model; these ambitions are however not being fully met currently. The extent to which the Liberal Arts approach is in tension with the vocationality inherent in this programme was an area of discussion during the Team’s site visit. Extensive and compelling research had been done before launch to justify the place of the programme, its contribution to the region and its market. Overall, it was clear from the site visit that VMU’s Acting programme aims and LEOs are based on public needs and are responsive to the labour market.

The Acting programme espouses one Aim, three Objectives and a suite of 6 Learning outcomes. The overarching aim is ambitious and multivalent: “to develop artists of the highest qualification, actors with the interdisciplinary skills, able to creatively manage and interrelate acting, text creation, directing practices, voice and movement skills for the professional career in the theatre, film and television and in other contemporary art forms; to develop independent, innovation driven creators able to successfully integrate into the contemporary art and creative industries spheres” (p.4). The conceptual thinking behind this aim - its meeting point with VMU’s Liberal Arts policy as a whole - was articulated in persuasive terms during the visit but the actualization of this aim in terms of the Learning Outcomes and the spread of resources is still in development. For instance, broad objectives cover the need to develop flexible, culturally aware and responsive actors for theatre, film and television whose vision is demonstrably

international and intercultural. In comparison, the 6 Learning outcomes are quite modest and pragmatic e.g. “to do creative work, individually and in groups” (p.4), a mismatch which was raised and discussed during the site visit.

Both the Programme Aims and the learning outcomes are compliant with Lithuanian Qualifications Framework Level VI and the latter are mapped against five competencies – Knowledge, Scientific research, Special Abilities, Social Abilities and Personal abilities in Annex 6.1. Of these, the most difficult to see being fully realized through the Learning Outcomes L01, L03, L05 and L06 is Scientific Research; the extent to which the critical and cultural awareness, flagged in the broad programme objectives, is taught and assessed across the programme was discussed at the site visit with Staff and students and, again, appeared to be emergent. That said, in broad terms the programme name, content and qualification are compatible.

Programme Aims and expected Learning outcomes are published in several public places - on the University and Faculty websites and through a series of ‘open door’ events for potential applicants and schoolchildren (p.5). The review cycle for Learning outcomes is every two years and these reviews are conducted with students, teachers and wider stakeholders. As the programme matures, this may be found to be too frequent, and could be extended to 3 years – to marry up more carefully with external review (3 years or 6 years).

The one priority for further development identified in the SER is cooperating and developing formal partnerships with ‘foreign universities’, which is consonant with the ambition and outward facing character of the degree programme. Plans for this were in evidence and well advanced but there was a need to develop a more coherent strategy for its realisation, perhaps over five years. This would need to take an overview of staff and student exchange, international research projects, strategic partnerships driven by the University and at a local level, setting milestones for achievements each year.

Strengths observed in this area were the extent to which the liberal arts ethos had been reinvented to meet the needs of the programme, avoiding the perpetuation of stereotypes in the training. Weaknesses were the relatively pragmatic learning outcomes and the need to embed multi-disciplinarity throughout the whole of the student experience.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design meets the legal requirements that regulate such studies. In scope it consists of 240 credits, duration 4 years (requirement not more 240 credits). The General University subjects consist of 56 credits (requirement not less 15 credits); subjects of the Study field consist of 184 credits (requirement not less 165 credits). Subjects defined by the University and optionally chosen by the student consist of 32 credits and 27 credits, totalling 59 credits (requirement not more than 60 credits). 15 credits are allocated for the Study practice (requirement not less 15 credits), and 12 credits are assigned for the Final thesis (requirement not less 12 credits). The minimum scope of the study subject is 3 credits (requirement not less 3 credits). The subjects are organized evenly over the study semesters, 29 or 31 credits per semester, totalling 60 credits per year. The number of subjects within a semester is 6 or 7 (requirement not more than 7).

The scope of the study programme is sufficient to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The curriculum design is presented clearly and neatly (SER, table 2.2., p. 7, Annexes 2-5). It is characterised by diversity and flexibility, with possibilities for individualisation. It sits within VMU's unique system of studies aspiring to a multi-disciplinary approach to acting with the purpose to increase self-employment opportunities and avoiding some of the pitfalls of a director-led programme – characterised as perpetuating stereotypes by some of the students during the site visit. Students can choose introductory subjects in such areas as Biomedical and Physical sciences, Humanitarian sciences, Social sciences, Economics and Management. Also, they have possibilities to select subjects from a broad list of optional subjects within the Study field and learn subjects from the optional subject group. The curriculum is also oriented towards expanding the range of optional subjects (subjects related to voice techniques were included additionally, for instance).

For successful implementation of this individualisation a strong and focused core of the curriculum needs to be developed. For that purpose the coherence of the content in the Study field is reached by applying many principles. Subjects are grouped according to core acting competences or movement abilities, or structured in modules (e.g. theatre history, acting, stage speech). The relationship between theoretical and practical subjects is also established (several optional subjects of the Study field group are theoretical and supplement some practical subjects of the same group). But an imbalance between content and programme aims sometimes appears. The programme is aiming to educate actors “for the professional career in the theatre, film and television and other contemporary art forms” (SER, p. 4), whilst the proportion of subjects

allocated to the cinema experience and knowledge is rather small. Acting in front of a camera is integrated into the subject “Acting in new media”, partially – in Stage speech. Elements of the film are included in Creative writing. “Cinema history and analysis” is an optional subject in one semester and worth 5 credits.

From experts’ dialogue with stakeholders it was clear that Kaunas and its region expect more varied creative troupes to emerge over time, so there is scope for future specialisations to be considered in later developments of the curriculum, for example, puppet theatre.

The subjects during semesters are spread evenly. The content of each subject is clearly defined in its title and in the topics, as well, in the intended learning outcomes and criteria for evaluation. It is clear that the subjects / modules provide students with the knowledge, skills and competences according to the First Cycle of qualification. Also, the subjects reflect the main modern tendencies in theory and practice (e.g., Creativity and self-management, Creative writing, the emphasis on M. Chekhov methods).

It is seen from the descriptions of the subjects that various methods are applied: lectures, seminars, presentations, discussions, individual creative projects. In practical subjects special attention is devoted to methods that promote students’ creativity: improvisation, brainstorming, etc. During theoretical subjects teachers apply such methods, as case analysis, literature analysis, etc. From the visit to the site, it is clear that digital and online tools (First Class (FC), Moodle conferences) are being used. The list of the references of each subject is appropriate, covering the modern resources in the field. But the number of copies of indicated books in some cases seems to be small at the university library (more copies are in self study rooms).

The site visit revealed that the conception of Final Project should be considered a commendable aspect of the programme, grounded in previous experience in other study programmes. The Project consists of theoretical and practical parts; the practical part presents creative stage work, whereas the theoretical part describes the creative stage work implemented. There is scope for cinematic aspects of the Project to be developed further.

Strengths observed in this area are the diversity of Subject options open to students in the programme and the well-described requirements for the Final Thesis. A weakness was the extent to which the aims to develop an interdisciplinary actor could be achieved with the current levels of film and media input into the curriculum.

2.3. Teaching staff

Faculty is composed of 26 teachers: 2 professors, 4 associated professors with doctoral degree, 6 associated professors – accredited artists, 2 lecturers with doctoral degree and 10 lecturers – accredited artists, 2 assistants.

In what concerns staff structure, competences and workload, SER is a comprehensive document, giving an impressive image of a well balanced and active institution and Programme, with teachers accomplishing various duties and significant objectives in areas such as their own intense and much awarded artistic productivity, pedagogical and methodological research, international participation, dissemination initiatives (conferences, festivals, public and broadcasted lectures, traineeships) and scientific research – the latter being manifested by the participation of professors in relevant and competitive scientific projects.

Faculty is rather young (average of 42 years and a significant concentration of teachers in the interval 29-39 years), as is the Programme itself, indicating that its sustainability is not threatened, at least in the medium future. The methodology for recruitment is sound. As stated in SER (p.10): “Academic staff is hired by public competition (information is announced in VMU, the Research Council of Lithuania websites, Lithuanian researchers mobility portal). The applicants are to meet the minimum official requirements defined by VMU. The competence and qualification of the applicants are tested by the VMU Attestation Committee, the candidate selection takes place in the Faculty Council and is approved by VMU Senate. The teachers are employed following the descriptions of qualification requirements approved by VMU Senate as well as teacher and academic personnel’s attestation order”.

At the end of each 5 year period, each teacher is allowed to ask for an exemption from pedagogical work, using this work time to develop her/his artistic and research qualification. Also the University has implemented measures to encourage teacher proficiency - for example a premium pay for the teachers who exceed the benchmark of scientific/pedagogical/artistic indicators. It is clear, therefore, that the University is effective in creating the right conditions for the professional development of staff and by extension the necessary provision of the programme.

As regards the staff structure, this Programme is very well equipped with a heterogeneous team in terms of skills, interests and qualifications. This is undoubtedly a significant potential, which,

going forward, can be even more fully exploited and put at the service of the whole educational community. In its present configuration - and perhaps because of the youth of the programme – there is a slight difficulty in articulating these potentialities, in particular the research infrastructure, which evidenced great vitality and commitment but which needed a more robust and articulable strategy for mobilising the research ‘clusters’ into income generating research engines. That is, however, in the context of the assessment Team’s celebration of a significant number of interesting research projects whose titles are “Invisible Communities: Cases of community art”, “Expansion of Communication Competencies of Cultural Institutions in the Context of the Society of Know-how and Creativity“, ”Post-Soviet Lithuanian theatre: history, identity, memory“, ”Research of Lithuanian theatre: the research of efficiency of the system of Lithuanian theatre and the outlines of its modernisation“, ”The bridge of cultures: relations of Lithuanian and Polish theatres in early 20th century”.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

Students are housed and taught in a number of generic and specialist spaces on the programme, given its Liberal Arts structure. For their General University Study Subjects (Groups A, B and D) some 100 auditoria are available across the University. For their specialist subjects (Group C) lessons are taught in the Faculty of Arts across the VMU Theatre, Main Hall and Arts Centre Hall. The former is described in the SER as ‘one of the best equipped chamber theatres in Kaunas and the best equipped learning theatre in Lithuania’ (p.20). Students need to travel between three main sites – the Faculty building, the large Dance studio and to the Library – but this was not felt to be disruptive according to students. Nevertheless, there is an inevitable impact on the achievement of a multi-disciplinary training programme for actors, as the number of natural, creative moments of inspiration occasioned by contact across media is reduced. The site visit facilitated access to these spaces to flesh out the descriptions in Section 4 of the SER.

Several spaces are identified for the purpose of consulting students: an Administration office, a Meeting and Reading room, the Contemporary Art Department office and Theatre Studies department office. The number of individual workplaces for the teachers is described as ‘satisfactory’ (p.17). It was not clear from the SER how individual consultancies with students are managed and the site visit did not clear up this question. More significantly, the Assessment Team felt that individual creative work, for instance on the forthcoming Final Thesis, could not be fully supported within the resource-base observed, were the group to decide to do individual rather than group work in Year 4. Boundaries for decision-making concerning individual or group work need to be more firmly drawn.

The University has a robust renewal policy for information technology. The average age of computer stock is only two years and this is described as ‘completely satisfactory’ for the programme (p.17), with the renewal of the fifth of these every year, including the purchase of new projectors. This is a generous policy of renewal by any standards. Study materials are distributed via a virtual learning environment, in this case Moodle. This is mainly used in theoretical subjects, but clearly has scope for the support of practical subjects too. Resources extend to external study practices, mainly at the National Kaunas Drama Theatre but also at 14 other ‘social partners’ offering places for student practice (p.18).

The main university Library is separate from the Arts Faculty and is refurbished to a very high specification. Specialist study materials visible on the shelves were not however extensive, and given the aims for the development of a multidisciplinary actor the further investment in resources must be considered a priority.

A cautionary note is struck in the final paragraph of this section of the SER (p.20), identifying increasing student numbers and the resulting lack of additional spaces for individual work. Rooms observed on the Site visit were well equipped but not numerous and many of them were shared with students on other study programmes. The extent to which the current resource base can support the ambition of a fully integrated actor, able first to access and then to mobilise film, television and multi-media technologies, as well as be trained in the fundamentals of stage acting, is questionable at this stage in the development of the programme.

Areas of strengths observed in this section of the assessment are the current developments and future ambitions for infrastructure investment. Areas of weakness are the spaces available for individual work (given the current inclusive approach to student choice) and the apparent lack of *Individual* programme resources for film, television and multimedia work, bearing in mind the main aim of the study programme.

2.5. Study process and students‘ performance assessment

VMU has developed a very strong outreach strategy to potential applicants. The process of admission to the study programme is well defined and transparent. The admission requirements are open to public and posted on LAMA BPO and the website of the Faculty of Arts (hereinafter – FA). All criteria for the entrance examination are very structured and clear. Consultations are

organised to discuss the entrance exam requirements and to consult candidates on practical tasks. However, only a few students used this opportunity during the preparation.

At the orientation week students are presented with information about the Programme's aims, structure, study process, academic and ethical requirements. All previously mentioned information is available on VMU website. This information is available in the Moodle system as well. However, according to some of the students, it is not always easy to find evaluation criteria of subjects in the Moodle. The timetable of each semester contains study subject, class work form, time and location and is posted on the VMU First Class system and the FA notice board before the semester starts. Students have about 5-7 exams during the 3 week exams period.

Students' meetings with FA and Head of Study Programme Committee are held at the beginning and the end of the semester. Here future plans and/or problems can be discussed. All students have the possibility to have consultations with teachers both directly and via Internet (e-mail, First Class system, Moodle). It was clear from the site visit that students feel free to express their opinion or dissatisfaction at any time.

Students have many possibilities to participate in different creative projects in Lithuania and abroad. Social partners of FA and VMU Theatre offer students the opportunity to get engaged in professional work during the studies. Early practice allows students to start their professional career while studying at the university. Students have the possibility to meet famous Lithuanian theatre and film representatives.

International student mobility via the Erasmus+ programme has not been implemented in the Programme yet, despite the fact that FA cooperates with 13 universities from different countries. However, a lot of international cooperation is carried out by students' participation in international art projects, creative workshops and seminars. Students' mobility in study programme is low because of their unwillingness to suspend intensive studies – they felt, that it would be hard to come back into the normal track of VMU study life.

The evaluation and marking of the students are explained in detail, made publicly available and follow strict rules and requirements. Students can access the assessment criteria information for individual study subjects on VMU website, in VMU First class intranet and Moodle systems. Whilst the Final Thesis project is yet to run, organisational parameters for this module remained unnecessarily fluid: student choice either to work individually or in groups was ostensibly

without limitations. In practice this would not be achievable and this needed clarifying and stating plainly to students.

Overall, the study process organisation is appropriate for the achievement of the Programme's stated LEOs.

Strengths in this area are 1) the longitudinal engagement of students with social partners from the first year; 2) the commitment to internationalization; 3) clear assessment criteria. A weakness is in a lack of clarity in the boundaries between individual and group work possibilities - specifically for Final Thesis.

2.6. Programme management

The programme management of Acting at Vytautas Magnus University is very clearly described and well structured; information is exhaustive and relevant, and the site visit confirmed the data provided by the SER. Bodies that carry different responsibilities are named and their respective roles in the decision-making and realization chain specified: Study Programme Committee (SPC) controls the achievement of Learning Outcomes, carries out quality supervision and supervises the renewal of the programme; the Faculty of Arts (FA) approves all the changes; the Contemporary Arts Department (CAD) is responsible for their implementation. The Chair of the Study Programme Committee is at the same time the head of the VMU theatre. As the programme was established in 2012, there have been no previous external evaluations, but the programme fully complies with all formal quality measures and principles of the Vytautas Magnus University.

Quality assurance is embedded on many levels. The Study Programme Committee is well structured, and among its members are not only teachers, but also one student and one external stakeholder; the input of these members represents an on-going feedback from within the institution as well as from the outside. The University has its Office for Quality and Strategy, and the system uses various measures, such as cooperation between programme executives and university academic and non-academic subdivisions (therefore, even subsidiary bodies are involved) or student-teacher-employer cooperation. The Rector's Order on Teaching Quality Evaluation formulates the main principles of teacher's (self) evaluation and qualification framework. Similarly, the teachers' workload is defined by internal documents. The university consistently works with data and uses them for analysis and renewal of current study

programmes (for example the analysis of the current state and the needs of Lithuanian theatre, or the use of international comparative analysis of similar programmes in the whole Baltic region).

The management of the programme on all levels shows a strong commitment to further improvement. Important strategic investments were made in recent years (a new theatre was refurbished; the Arts faculty moved to a new building which was completely renovated). Internationalization is a clear issue and an area for development, if the programme does not want to address only the local – or even regional – market; among geographic priorities for international cooperation “eastern countries” were mentioned, and also U.S.A., Japan and Korea. During the site visit, though, mostly cooperation with partner artists from French speaking countries was used as example, and there seems to be little institutional cooperation so far.

The expert team appreciates the lucidity of the analysis of the situation in acting profession throughout Lithuania carried out by the management before the programme was launched, and also the use of a broader analysis of the profession in the Baltic region. It is clear that the programme corresponds and reacts to a formulated need of the local market. The site visit confirmed that social partners as stakeholders are positively involved with the programme as they wish for a new generation of actors: more versatile, possessing diverse skills and less formed by the classical master-pupil system. The management is pragmatic, aware of the necessity to cooperate with different social partners, such as advertising companies etc.; nevertheless, during the site visit, the expert team could meet only stakeholders from theatres, it is therefore difficult to judge to what extent the programme reaches (or will reach) other areas of employment.

It should also be stated that two departments share the responsibility for the delivery of the programme: the Theatre Studies Department and the Contemporary Arts Department. There is a good communication and cooperation between the two departments, and balance between theoretical and practical disciplines seems to be maintained as a positive aspect of studies. Students’ anonymous surveys (online for general university subjects, paper questionnaire for more discipline specific subjects) are carried out regularly, but from testimony in the meetings with students it was clear that they prefer less formal ways of giving feedback. The university claims its ambition to look for alternative ways in order to stimulate formal feedback. Nevertheless, art schools and programmes with small numbers of students naturally use the most “natural” evaluation methods, therefore an organic and flexible combination of formal and informal evaluation processes should be maintained.

The site visit showed that quality assurance measures were effective and efficient and that the whole staff was relatively well engaged in implementing them.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To develop further the Departments' internationalisation campaign and to articulate a clear (five year) strategy for its realisation.
2. To strongly encourage the development of both MA and PhD programmes at an appropriate time in the development of Departments' portfolio and of the Staff team.
3. To revisit the aims and learning outcomes of the study programme and to work to ensure that the ambition of the programme as whole is reflected in the details of the learning outcomes - in terms of complexity and diversity.
4. To review the overall facilities and the underpinning resource base, particularly in terms of their fitness for purpose for individual and interdisciplinary work.
5. To draw clearer boundaries between what is achievable in terms of individual versus group work, specifically in the Final thesis.
6. To encourage to the programme team to develop new specialisations in dialogue with stakeholders.
7. Bibliographic sources need further development and referencing in the programme literature.

IV. SUMMARY

The acting programme at Vytautas Magnus University (hereinafter – VMU) is a very new programme (launched in 2012), which positions itself as unique or ‘exceptional’ (p.3 of SER) in the context of other acting programmes in Lithuania. Its uniqueness is evidenced by its contemporaneity, its ambitions for multi-disciplinarity and its adoption of the Artes Liberales model. Extensive and compelling research had been done before launch to justify the place of the programme, its contribution to the region and its market. The overarching aim of the programme is ambitious and multivalent and the conceptual thinking behind it - its meeting point with VMU’s Liberal Arts policy as a whole - was articulated in persuasive terms during the visit but the actualization of this aim in terms of the Learning Outcomes and the spread of resources is still in development.

The SER identified the need for developing formal partnerships with ‘foreign universities’. Plans for this were in evidence and well advanced but there was a need to develop a more coherent strategy for its realisation, perhaps over five years.

The curriculum design is presented clearly and neatly (SER, table 2.2., p. 7, Annexes 2-5). It is characterised by diversity and flexibility, with possibilities for individualisation. It sits within VMU’s unique system of studies aspiring to a multi-disciplinary approach to acting to increase self-employment opportunities and avoiding some of the pitfalls of a director-led programme – characterised as perpetuating stereotypes by some of the students during the site visit. However, an imbalance between content and programme aims sometimes appears. The programme is aiming to educate actors “for the professional career in the theatre, film and television and other contemporary art forms” (SER, p. 4), whilst the proportion of subjects allocated to these other media experiences and study is rather small.

In terms of staff structure, competences and workload, both the SER and the site visit confirmed an impressive image of a well balanced and active institution and Programme, with teachers accomplishing various duties and significant objectives in areas such as their own intense and much awarded artistic productivity, pedagogical and methodological research, international participation, dissemination initiatives (conferences, festivals, public and broadcasted lectures, traineeships) and scientific research – the latter being manifested by the participation of professors in relevant and competitive scientific projects. In its present configuration - and perhaps because of the youth of the programme – the research infrastructure, which evidenced

great vitality and commitment nevertheless needed a more robust and articulable strategy for mobilising the research 'clusters' into income generating research engines.

A cautionary note is struck in the final paragraph of this section of the SER (p,20), identifying increasing student numbers and the resulting lack of additional spaces for individual work. Rooms observed on the Site visit were well equipped but not numerous and many of them were shared with students on other study programmes. The extent to which the current resource base, including the modest hard copy specialist study materials in the library, can support the ambition of a fully integrated actor, able first to access and then to mobilise film, television and multi-media technologies, as well as be trained in the fundamentals of stage acting, is questionable at this stage in the development of the programme.

Strengths in the study process and assessment include the longitudinal engagement of students with social partners from the first year; the commitment to internationalization; and the use of clear assessment criteria. A weakness is in a lack of clarity in the boundaries between individual and group work achievements.

The programme management of Acting at Vytautas Magnus University is very clearly described and well structured; information is exhaustive and relevant, and the site visit confirmed the data provided by the SER. Bodies that carry different responsibilities are named and their respective roles in the decision-making and realization chain specified. Two departments share the responsibility for the delivery of the programme: the Theatre Studies Department and the Contemporary Arts Department. There is a good communication and cooperation between the two departments, and balance between theoretical and practical disciplines seems to be maintained as a positive aspect of studies. Internationalization is a clear issue and an area for development, if the programme does not want to address only the local – or even regional – market; among geographic priorities for international cooperation “eastern countries” were mentioned, and also U.S.A., Japan and Korea. During the site visit, though, mostly cooperation with partner artists from French speaking countries was used as example, and there seems to be little institutional cooperation so far.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Acting* (state code – 612W40003) at Vytautas Magnus University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Teaching staff	4
4.	Facilities and learning resources	2
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	18

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

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

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

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

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

**VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ
PROGRAMOS VAIDYBA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612W40003)
2015-06-25 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-171 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto studijų programa *Vaidyba* (valstybinis kodas – 612W40003) 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	2
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	18

* 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

Vytauto Didžiojo universitete (toliau – VDU) vykdoma studijų programa *Vaidyba* yra labai nauja (pradėta 2012 m.). Ji pristatoma kaip unikali arba išsiskirianti iš kitų Lietuvoje vykdomų vaidybos programų (savianalizės suvestinė (toliau – SS), 3 p.). Programos unikalumą liudija šiuolaikiškumas, daugiadalykiškumo ambicijos ir *Artes Liberales* modelio taikymas. Prieš pradedant vykdyti programą atlikti išsamūs tyrimai, skirti programos vietai, jos svarbai regionui

ir rinkai pateisinti. Svarbiausias programos tikslas yra ambicingas ir įvairiapusis. Per ekspertų apsilankymą buvo įtikinamai suformuluotas studijų programos konceptualusis suvokimas – atitikti VDU laisvųjų menų politiką, nors šio tikslo realizavimas studijų rezultatų prasme ir išteklių paskirstymas dar nebaigtas.

SS nurodytas poreikis kurti formalios partnerystės ryšius su užsienio universitetais. Planai akivaizdūs, pasiekta didelė pažanga, tačiau būtina parengti nuoseklesnę įgyvendinimo, galbūt per penkerius metus, strategiją.

Programos sandara parengta aiškiai ir gerai (SS 2.2 lentelė, 7 p., 2–5 priedai). Ji pasižymi įvairove ir lankstumu bei galimybe pritaikyti individualiai. Ji įtraukta į unikalią VDU studijų sistemą, kuria siekiama taikyti tarpdalykinį požiūrį į vaidybą, turint tikslą padidinti savisamdos galimybes ir išvengti kai kurių režisieriaus vadovaujamos programos spąstų, kai vadovaujamosi stereotipų taikymu, kaip per apsilankymą nurodė kai kurie studentai. Tačiau kartais atsiranda turinio ir programos tikslų neatitikimų. Programa siekiama parengti aktorius, kurie galėtų „daryti profesinę karjerą teatre, kine, televizijoje ir kitose šiuolaikinio meno srityse“ (SS, 4 p.), tačiau dalykų, skirtų kitoms medijoms ir studijoms, dalis gana menka.

Kalbant apie personalo struktūrą, kompetencijas ir darbo krūvį, tiek SS, tiek per apsilankymą universitete pasitvirtino įspūdingas gerai subalansuotos ir aktyvios institucijos ir programos įvaizdis: dėstytojai atlieka įvairias funkcijas ir siekia svarbių tikslų tokiose srityse kaip jų pačių reikšminga, apdovanojimų susilaukianti meninė veikla, pedagoginiai ir metodiniai tyrimai, dalyvavimas tarptautinėje veikloje, sklaidos iniciatyvos (konferencijos, festivaliai, viešos ir transliuojamos paskaitos, stažuotės) ir moksliniai tyrimai, kuriuos įrodo profesorių dalyvavimas atitinkamuose ir konkurencinguose mokslo projektuose. Šiuo metu (gal todėl, kad programa nauja) mokslinių tyrimų infrastruktūra yra gyvybinga ir pasižymi tyrėjų įsipareigojimu, bet būtina parengti tvirtesnę ir aiškiau suformuluotą strategiją, kuri padėtų sutelkti mokslinių tyrimų grupes į pajamas kuriančias mokslinių tyrimų sistemas.

Paskutinėje SS skyriaus pastraipoje (20 p.) pateikiama pastaba, kad studentų skaičius didėja, todėl atsiranda papildomų erdvių individualiam darbui stoka. Ekspertų grupės aplankytos patalpos įrengtos gerai, nors jų nedaug, daugeliu jų dalijamasi su kitų studijų programų studentais. Abejonių šiame programos kūrimo etape kelia dabartinės išteklių bazės mastas, įskaitant kuklią spausdintinę specialistams skirtą studijų medžiagą bibliotekoje. Kyla klausimas, ar galima patenkinti ambicijas parengti visapusišką aktorius, kuris visų pirma turėtų prieigą prie

kino, televizijos ir daugialypės terpės technologijų ir po to jas galėtų mobilizuoti ir kuriam būtų suteikti sceninės vaidybos pagrindai.

Studijų proceso ir vertinimo stiprybės: studentų ilgalaikis bendravimas su socialiniais partneriais nuo pat pirmųjų studijų metų, įsipareigojimas didinti tarptautiškumą ir aiškių vertinimo kriterijų naudojimas. Silpnybė – nėra aiškos ribos tarp individualaus ir grupinio darbo pasiekimų.

Vytauto Didžiojo universitete vykdomos studijų programos *Vaidyba* vadyba labai aiškiai aprašyta ir gerai struktūrizuota, informacija išsami, aktuali, per apsilankymą pasitvirtino SS pateikti duomenys. Įvardyti visi skirtingas funkcijas atliekantys organai, nurodyti jų vaidmenys priimant sprendimus ir realizuojant sukurtą seką. Už programos vykdymą bendrai atsako dvi katedros: Teatro studijų katedra ir Šiuolaikinių menų katedra. Abi katedros puikiai bendrauja ir bendradarbiauja, išlaikyta teorinių ir praktinių disciplinų pusiausvyra, o tai yra teigiamas studijų aspektas. Tarptautiškumo klausimas aiškiai įvardytas, jį reikia plėtoti, jei programoje nenorima apsiriboti tik vietos ar regiono rinka. Tarp tarptautinio bendradarbiavimo geografinių prioritetų buvo minimos Rytų šalys ir taip pat JAV, Japonija ir Korėja. Vizito metu dažniausiai buvo pateikiami bendradarbiavimo su partneriais menininkais iš prancūzakalbių šalių pavyzdžiai, tačiau institucinis bendradarbiavimas kol kas nėra aktyvus.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Toliau kurti katedrų tarptautiškumo didinimo kampaniją ir aiškiai suformuluoti (penkerių metų) jos įgyvendinimo strategiją.
2. Primygtinai skatinti kurti magistrantūros ir doktorantūros studijų programas tinkamu laiku, kai rengiama katedros studijų dalis ir formuojama personalo komanda.
3. Peržiūrėti studijų programos tikslus ir studijų rezultatus, siekti, kad išsamiuose studijų rezultatuose atsispindėtų bendras programos siekis, kalbant apie sudėtingumą ir įvairovę.
4. Iš naujo įvertinti patalpas ir pagrindinę išteklių bazę, ypač turint omenyje jų tinkamumą konkrečiam savarankiško ir tarpdalykinio darbo tikslui.

5. Nubrėžti aiškesnes ribas tarp to, kas pasiekama, kalbant apie savarankišką ir komandinį darbą, ypač rengiant baigiamąjį darbą.
6. Skatinti programos personalą, pasitarus su socialiniais dalininkais, kurti naujas specializacijas.
7. Toliau plėsti programos literatūros bibliografinius šaltinius ir nuorodas.

<...>

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)