



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus dailės akademijos (Vilniaus fakulteto)  
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS „SKULPTŪRA“**  
*(valstybinis kodas - 612W10004)*  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT**  
**OF "SCULPTURE" (state code - 612W10004)**  
**STUDY PROGRAMME**  
at Vilnius Art Academy (Vilnius Faculty)

**Review' team:**

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

**Evaluation coordinator -**

***Mrs Kristina Maldonienė***

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language – English

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

|  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
| Studijų programos pavadinimas                        | <i>Skulptūra</i>    |
| Valstybinis kodas                                    | 612W10004           |
| Studijų sritis                                       | Menai               |
| Studijų kryptis                                      | Dailė               |
| Studijų programos rūšis                              | Universitetinės     |
| Studijų pakopa                                       | Pirmoji             |
| Studijų forma (trukmė metais)                        | Nuolatinė (4 metai) |
| Studijų programos apimtis kreditais                  | 240 ECTS            |
| Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija | Dailės bakalauras   |
| Studijų programos įregistravimo data                 | 1997-05-19          |

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

|   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| Title of the study programme                        | <i>Sculpture</i>    |
| State code  | 612W10004           |
| Study area  | Arts                |
| Study field   | Art studies         |
| Type of the study programme                         | University studies  |
| Study cycle   | First               |
| Study mode (length in years)                        | Full-time (4 years) |
| Volume of the study programme in credits            | 240 ECTS            |
| Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded | Bachelor of Arts    |
| Date of registration of the study programme         | 1997-05-19          |

© Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras  
The Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education

## CONTENTS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| 1.1. Background of the evaluation process .....                              | 4         |
| 1.2. General.....  | 4         |
| 1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information ..... | 4         |
| 1.4. The Review Team.....  | 6         |
| <b>II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| 2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....                               | 6         |
| 2.2. Curriculum design .....   | 8         |
| 2.3 Teaching Staff.....  | 11        |
| 2.4. Facilities and learning resources .....                                 | 12        |
| 2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....                 | 14        |
| 2.6. Programme management .....  | 17        |
| 2.7. Examples of excellence .....  | 19        |
| <b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>  | <b>20</b> |
| <b>IV. SUMMARY .....</b>   | <b>22</b> |
| <b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>   | <b>25</b> |

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### ***1.1. Background of the evaluation process***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### ***1.2. General***

The Application documentation submitted by the HEI follows the outline recommended by the SKVC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. V-41 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 6/April/2017.

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

## II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

### 2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The review team is confirmed in their view that the BA programme aims and learning outcomes are well-defined, clear and updated in accordance to the Arts Study Field Descriptor. They are publicly announced on the website of the Sculpture Department of VAA ([www.vda.lt](http://www.vda.lt)) (SER p26) and they satisfy the needs of the students, graduates and social stakeholders at a very high level, as evidenced in the conversations at meetings. The main objective of the programme – *to prepare contemporary (sculpture) artists ready to reflect and participate in the local and international art field* - (SER p7) aligns with the entirety of the learning outcomes (SER pp13-15) which equally correspond to the mission and operational objectives of VAA VF which sees itself as an *educational institution of visual arts... capable of preparing professional artists* (SER p4). The above programme objective is also evidenced in the quality and breadth of student work as well as exhibitions. The review team are pleased to see that the conceptualisation of materiality is a common feature of the student work. The review team commend the programme for its clear focus on performing artistic research and developing contemporary art, also within the institution of the VAA itself ... *Contemporary Sculpture Programme fills the niche for investigatory innovative art, the Academy's strategy does not include a strategy for the development of contemporary art, even though the concept itself does fit the Descriptor on Fine Arts...* (SER p.7). In relation to this point raised in the SER the review team would invite the VAA to consider a strategy for contemporary art as part of its mission statement.

The review team concur that the programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the state, societal and labour market needs, evidenced: firstly by the fact that 22 out of 23 graduates responding to the alumni survey (2012-2016) are practising artists or work in their field of specialty (SER p34) and 19 of them are self-employed, with other areas of creative practice being theatre scenography, cinema studios, curating galleries, museums and art centres, teaching sculpture or drawing in art schools, all contributing to the GDP (SER p34); secondly the learning outcomes support students to gain knowledge and skills that are designed to give them experience in societal contexts and contribute to the well-being (SER p34) of the country (LOs D1 and E2); thirdly the preparedness of social partners to employ students and graduates and offer opportunities for engagement in their organisations (stakeholder meeting). It was noted that in the meeting with the review team, that the students stated that they are not ‘very socially minded – more about the individual’ – so perhaps a generational shift has happened – indicating the ‘me’ generation. The review team recommends that the programme could involve more collaborative, socially engaged and contextual thinking (all very current art zones), which might then have a positive impact for students to become more socially inclined. The strong relationships with social partners is largely focussed on access to curatorial skills and professional exhibition networks, spaces and opportunities, that support students in their next steps after graduation.

The review team agrees that programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked professional requirements (LOs A2, B1, C1, C2, C3 and E2). This goal is additionally supported by the week-long group exhibitions of the work of the students of all years held at the end of each semester that are open to external visitors, as well as an objective *...to create a finished artwork no matter the stage or year of study* (SER p12). There is one area with regard professional skills preparation to do with funding, that the review team sees is missing in the subject content (see 2.2), and this could be emphasised in the learning outcomes. The academic requirements cannot be disaggregated from the professional, but are emphasised in the role artistic research (SER p8) plays within the programme (LOs A1, B1, B3).

The main aim of the programme has independence of action as a key aspirational characteristic of graduates (LOs B3 and C2), reflected in the pedagogical approach which encourages independent learning and taking responsibility for their own artistic direction, which is instilled in the students through a student-centred ethos. Being a personality-based study programme it is built on the diversity of personal experiences, views and approaches to artistic expression provided by both teachers of the department and visiting practitioners and theoreticians. Students on the BA find that the balance between guidance and independent learning works for them.

Overall, the review team confirms that the title of the BA programme is appropriate, as understood in a contemporary context. It could possibly be changed to 'Contemporary Sculpture' (sometimes it appears this way but on the heading of this report the official award title is 'Sculpture'), to give emphasis to its strengths and differentiate it from the other Sculpture programmes in VAA. However, the review team is content for that to be the decision of VAA VF. The intended learning outcomes, the content of the programme and the qualification to be obtained are well aligned. The programme also corresponds to first-cycle of studies and the level of qualifications is comparable to other Bachelors programmes known to the review team. The review team heard that all teaching is integrated: all the BA and MA students are mixed. While this is an understandable position - as the principle is that students are treated individually all the way through their education, yet benefit from peer learning and having a collective/group focus at times e.g. in workshops - the review team also recommends that a greater degree of separation between BA and MA is necessary - this needs the identity of the each programme to establish their particular relevant content and quality expectancies.

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

The BA Sculpture programme structure is governed by the legislative requirements including the Descriptor of the Study Field of Art. The review team noted (SER p16) that the programme offers 240 credits of which: 24 credits are in General university study subjects and the legal requirement is 15 or more; 171 credits are in study field subjects and the legal requirement is 165 or more; 45 credits are in optional general and study field subjects and the legal requirement is 60 or less; 21 credits are in the thesis (final project) and the legal requirement is 15 or more. The review team consider that the programme structure is in line with the legislative requirements, even though the traineeship (practice) – 3 credits, is combined with specialty subjects. The review team understand from the SER (p17) and discussions in meetings with the teachers that the Faculty/Department decided to review the way that Practical Training was delivered at VAA VF. Subsequently it has been placed into the programme as individual research and practical practice, at whichever relevant point is needed in relation to each students particular needs - knowledge or experience enters in an integrated and flexible manner – which is a very pertinent stance. However, the review team senses that, by rejecting what the programme team consider a rather outmoded practice and re-positioning it in totality, something got lost which could still bear relevance, for example in the area of fabrication outsourcing. It was stated that this is not just a 'pay and receive' situation, but rather an opportunity to learn about materials and process, collaborate and project manage and thus an enlargement of perception takes place – which the review team supports and suggests this type of open attitude, which takes on board the complexities involved, could be the framework of a more



focused ‘summer practice’ type workshop (not necessarily in the summer!), supplementing and building stable blocks of knowledge and experience into the programme which are not possible from the departments’ own resources. At present, it is clear from the student meeting, that they are unsure how practical training has recently been integrated into speciality subjects (LO D1 and E2). The review team recommends that the programme team revisits the issue of practical training to address the above considerations.

The review team saw that subjects of study are taught in a consistent manner in the studio and that great effort has been made since the previous validation to maintain a dialogue between staff teaching in the humanities and those in the studio (subject field) to ensure an holistic learning experience for the students, though as it states in the SER p10, there is concern that the humanities block has not changed in 10 years and there remains a problem with Art History modules which do not provide appropriate content for the BA Contemporary Sculpture programme. The review team did not see any evidence of subjects being repeated but there are certain omissions in the curriculum relating to contemporary theory that are being filled by the study subject staff through the *Investigation Bureau* as well as new humanities subjects (see also below).

The content of subjects (Annexes no.1 and 2) corresponds to the type and cycle of studies in the arts at university first cycle (BA), which includes 240 ECTS credit points over 8 semesters. The number of subjects does not exceed 7 per semester (SER p16). Through the SER and the meetings and viewing documentation of the students’ artwork the review team found that the subjects of the study programme support the acquisition of skills in contemporary sculpture and were pleased to see the breadth of media and presentational approaches employed by students. The review team also welcomed the focus on contemporary sculpture practice from the start of semester 1 - this provides time for students to develop a thorough knowledge and understanding of their study subject (e.g. LOs A1 and A2).

Reviewing the scope of the programme and content of subjects (Annex no.2) and related study methods the review team can see that students have been able to achieve the intended outcomes (e.g. LO B3) – firstly through the strong culture of research methods that is embedded throughout study subjects and starts early in the programme (SSMP MB0191), and secondly through positive evidence of students being incrementally introduced to and learning the methods and contexts of contemporary sculpture practice in the context of student-centred learning that is embedded in the pedagogical approach (SER p17). This contributes to the development and creation of independent artists who, in the review team’s opinion, *think through making*. Since the last evaluation in 2008 the introduction of *contemporary theory* (HB0216 and HB 0034)) from the humanities department

has provided an appropriate and useful content for students but has only partially filled the gap identified in the SER (p10). However, the review team commend department staff on the way they have mobilised their resources to further address this matter through a range of strategies including field trips, visiting critics/artists/curators/and delivering their own visiting artists and seminar programmes (LO B2, D1 and D2), but this is not a permanent solution and the review team recommend that the Faculty revisits the way that humanities subjects support the BA programme. The review team suggest that student-led seminars would offer a good learning opportunity alongside their self-initiated reading groups as adjuncts to other strategies, and would build on the excellent rapport and support between BA and MA students. Electives add a range of teaching and learning methods, as selected by students. Regarding HB0038 *Art in Public Spaces* and the review team wish to recommend that the VAA support the sculpture department with its connections to the City municipality in relation toward gaining permission for artist-driven works in public space.

In terms of professional skills, the generic subject SB0004 *The Basics of Business* does not appear to meet the specific needs of undergraduate sculpture students. Social Partner, Alumni and Students stated that there is an urgent need for subjects to cover grant funding proposal writing, residency application writing, and project proposal writing, which they voiced they were badly equipped for – it was also noted that folio presentation was poor. The review team recommends that the department initiate a solution as soon as possible – perhaps initially including the alumni (as Life Long Learning) so they could ‘catch-up’. This will equip all with the capacity to successfully obtain grants/funding, win commissions, get project support, fund exhibitions and generally to deal with bureaucracy – arranged as a part of a ‘professional artist introduction’ type workshop that the social partners could contribute to (please note this should also be introduced at MA).

The review team read (SER pp6-8) and heard evidence of engagement with the term ‘artistic research’ by teaching staff and students (LO B3) and encourage further discussion around these terms and current debates in the department. Students also have access to subjects and related equipment in which recent technological advancements are addressed and can be used by students (e.g. in computer visualisation subjects). The visiting artists and critics contribute to the currency of the curriculum by bringing international debates to the fore and thereby complimenting the international profile of staff. The review team heard evidence from the students that this supports them in preparing themselves to enter the global arts context, both in Lithuania, and in international settings. The review team therefore confirm that the content of the programme corresponds to the latest academic, artistic or technological achievements.

### ***2.3 Teaching Staff***

The review team noted that 100% of the teachers of Contemporary Sculpture are scientists or recognized artists (Annex no.3 and no.4) and that therefore more than 50% of study field subjects are taught by scientists or recognized artists. The academic staff of the department are hired through open competition in accordance with the legal requirements (SER p20). In 2016 there: 7 teachers in total, which has stayed a stable number except in 2012 there were 8; of the 7 teachers 3 are professors (although Annex no.3 suggests there are 4 professors); 2 are associate professors and between 2012-2015 there were 3 associate professors; and there have been between 1-2 lectures in the period 2012-2016; and 1 coordinator. VAA has the following teaching positions: professor, docent (associate professor), lecturer and assistant. These are subject to the minimum qualification requirements applicable throughout the tenure of five years and the review team were able to ascertain in meetings with Administration that certification is assessed every 5 years.

A unique process of student choice is exercised in the department in order to establish the amount of teaching each staff member does and an aspect of their salary (SER pp20-21), overseen by the Head of Department who allocates workloads. This is done via an internal agreement by the teachers because it is at variance with the VAA Study Regulations and the terms of VAA Employee Time Structure and Time Remuneration. The review teams had some initial concerns about the way students might 'follow trends' or value the staff representing 'flavours of the month'. However, the review team was reassured through the various meetings that this approach actually encouraged the motivation of staff who constantly review their pedagogical approaches and course content, so providing a high quality learning experience for students and long term support rather than a form of market economy. The review team were told that students exercise responsibility by reviewing the publically available teachers reports and they become able recognise where integrity exists among the staff. They also value that they can choose different teachers each semester. The review team's overall understanding is of a highly professional and motivated teaching staff on the BA Sculpture programme, evidenced by the high quality of student artwork (LO C2).

The review team confirms that the turnover of teaching staff (SER p21) is enough to ensure an adequate provision of the programme and to provide vitality and renewal (SER p10), mainly because of the combination between the core teachers, who update their subject knowledge constantly, and the number of invited visiting artists and critics and curators (SER p21) who supplement the teachers. This is particularly evident in the international and artistic and intellectual activities of core staff, which positively enhance the BA students' ability to place themselves in a international context (SER p7), including Lithuania as part of the global context (LO A2). Recent

appointments have enhanced the breadth of input regarding contemporary ideas and art debates (LO A1) and extended the curriculum to include artistic research methods (LO B3), and approaches such as installation art (SER p21). The series of visiting artists and critics are highly valued by the BA students (LO B2) and students request more (SER p18). It was noted in the SER (p18) and the meeting with those who wrote the SER that the students would welcome improved gender balance within the teaching input. The review team had noted the lack of female artists/teachers contributing to in the programme, except in the visiting category, and recommend that when the opportunity arises the Faculty address this imbalance within the core staff. (LO D1). The age range of teachers shows that there are younger teachers and some more experienced ones (SER p22).

The review team congratulate VAA and the Faculty on the implementation of the Systematic Professional Development of staff (SER p22), which is evidence that VAA VF ensures conditions for professional upgrading of staff necessary to implement the programme. In particular the review team were impressed by the support for the Head of Department to take so many management training courses. Staff mobility has been supported with international activities by at least 50% of the teachers (SER p22-23), in addition to visits to the Venice Biennial, Documenta; the Gdansk (PL) Reitveldt (NL) Dusseldorf (D) Academies; connecting into peer groups such as the Scandinavian, Nordic Network, Erasmus, etc. Sometimes trips are partially self-funded, and although the staff stated that the situation has improved, the review team recommend further investment in this facet, which staff view as an extended tool of artistic research, also affording important networking dialogues.

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

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

The review team commend the Faculty on the improvements made since the last evaluation in 2008 with the new facilities in the VAA Art and Design laboratory. During the tour of the laboratory the review team were presented to the scope of possibilities the students can use (not specified in SER). Laser-cutting, diverse specialized machinery for wood and metal work, spray painting and a state of the art CNC milling machine operated by an employed specialist. The system whereby students can

sign up via the intranet to book time at the different machinery works well, and hand tools can be borrowed to studios after registration. Basic materials are available for free to students. Safety regulations are taught and there are safety instruction boards in English and Lithuanian. However the centralisation of technical support puts a large load on the workshops of the Art and Design Laboratory due to the increased total number of students using them, especially towards the end of semester and the Faculty needs to keep the issue under review. Other facilities the students have access to: video lab, print lab and a computer classroom with updated software. For techniques other than those available in VAA the staff encourage (teacher meeting) students to be involved with outside partners, which is a negotiation skill artists also need.

There are adequate possibilities for students' practice both in the VAA and its creative bases (SER pp23-24) and through collaborations with social partners. Students have exhibitions outside the Academy: Vilnius Artfair, Contemporary Art Center, galleries (social partner meeting) and collaborate with other universities, especially for technology (student meeting). The Sculpture department prioritise field trips to international art venues like Documenta, Venice and Münster, funded partly externally. However, during the Social Partner meeting, they told us that Vilnius is lacking in independent artist-run spaces, which impacts upon graduates at the start of their professional careers – there exist some collective/collaborative studios and project spaces, but no artist-run galleries or event spaces. The review team suggest that the VAA and social partners on the study programme committee could advocate for such spaces on behalf of the graduates and students.

Teachers and students have access to VAA library and its divisions and to its several subscribed international and national databases (SER pp24-25.) The central library is spacious and houses large collections, but it was mentioned (SER meeting) that new acquisition wishes from the department were not always taken into account, which makes the library less relevant regarding the most recent developments in contemporary art and thinking. The review team recommend that the Administration should address this issue. The sculpture department has a collection of publications mostly through the teachers' own personal initiative, but do not have a budget of its own for the purpose. The policy of the Academy (administration meeting) is to buy books centrally and not have books in small department libraries as it would work against interdisciplinary purposes. The students mentioned that the library at the Contemporary Art Centre in Vilnius was used often and of high quality.

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

The review team see that entrance requirements are long established, consistent and transparent and are approved by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania and the Descriptor of the General Admission to First-cycle and Integrated Studies of Lithuanian Schools of Higher Education. The students have to pass an admissions exam and the process is competitive and involves drawing and modelling during one day. The results are assessed for all of VAA Sculpture programmes at Vilnius but with a representative from the sculpture departments at Vilnius, Kaunas and Telšiai plus two others. However, the results, which include previous exam grades are averaged and encoded and there is no opportunity to speak to candidates. The review team welcomes the discussions taking place to revise the admissions process (see 2.6) and agree with the reference in the SER (p26) that the process is currently unacceptable and some high quality artistic entrants may be passed over in favour of those with better exam results. In 2014 and 2015 2 students in VF received grants, and only one in 2016. The number of students admitted to the programme was 4 in 2012 and 2013, 7 in 2014, and 5 in 2015 and 2016 (SER p27). The highest number of students dropping out of their studies was 4 in 2016, and the lowest was none dropping out in 2015. The highest number of graduates was 14 in 2012, and this is now stabilised at an average of 7 per year (SER p27). The review team discussed this reduction in graduates with the SER group and understand that there is potential for more students if resources follow, but the number of graduates is appropriate.

The organisation of the study process (regulated by the Study Regulations of the Academy and approved at the start of the year) ensures proper implementation of the programme and achievement of the intended learning outcomes of a Bachelor of Sculpture (with contemporary specialism). The admitted students receive a schedule by email (to review) for their classes depending on which teacher's group they are in. The Schedule is aligned to the general schedule of the Department and to the number of students in the group, also to each teachers' intentions. Workload of the students per week and per semester and scheduling of exams is agreed so that it is manageable workload for the students, with examinations evenly distributed during exam periods (SER p27) and no more than 7 exams taking place in each session.

The review team read and heard about many opportunities for students' participation in specific artistic activities (equivalent to scientific activities) arranged by the teachers, used to enhance the student experience. For example in 2013 a joint creative workshop entitled 'New Relation' was held between the VAA Sculpture Department (4 students attended) and Warsaw Academy of Arts Sculpture Department in Krasnogruda, Poland. There is also evidence from meetings with the social

partners and students/alumni of student self-initiated involvement in exhibitions such as at CAC and AV17, which are supported by the department (often resources are lent or transport arranged). The review team agree with the programme team (SER p28) that the participation of students should depend on the individual needs and skills of each student, and be appropriate to their future career aspirations, and therefore varies accordingly. It is to be commended that the graduates and students of the Sculpture Department are highly active in the creative sector in Lithuania and internationally, and have represented Lithuania in the Venice Biennale on 7 occasions.

The review team were pleased to see the success of students at VF sculpture programme (an average of over 3 per year between 2012 and 2016) in participating in mobility programmes such as Erasmus+ and Nordplus and note the strong links with Willem de Kooning Academy of Fine Arts and Gerrit Rietveld Academie in the Netherlands (SER pp28-29). The review team therefore confirm that students are provided with conditions to take part in mobility programmes. For those students who are unable to go on exchange, the benefits of the department hosting exchange students is provided through engagement with their peers from across Europe, introducing them to the perspectives of other arts students, their approaches to contemporary art study, and building friendships and networks that will support them in the future.

VAA VF ensures proper academic and social support for students, as it is described in (SER pp29-30). The student body is represented by and informed of matters relating to the study programme through student representatives, the Students' Representative Council, the website ([www.vda.lt](http://www.vda.lt)), the Dean's Office of VAA, and through consultations with the Head of Department and teaching staff, supplemented by email and information posted on notice boards. The latter includes opportunities to participate in exhibitions, contests, etc. Students and graduates also disseminate information through a Facebook page called 'Sculpture Department' (SER p30). The Department also collects and stores data related to the implementation of the study programme that students can access. Academic support is available flexibly and through face-to-face contact, emails or phone with all the teachers who can advise on any organisational aspects, academic progress, study abroad, career routes and specific procedural matters such as retaking an exam (subject to VAA regulations and approval of the Dean). Study process, interim and final reviews are also used as feedback opportunities to find out if students are content with the level of consultation about their learning experience. There is also qualified psychological help for students at VAA reflecting the importance of the Programme for the Promotion of Mental Health. Recreational facilities are also available. Awarding of scholarships and benefits is regulated by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania, according The Regulations on the Granting of Scholarships of VAA. However, in the SER it is observed that financing is not adequate to satisfy students'

requirement for benefits (SER p31). Scholarship funding is democratically shared between all students in the department.

The system of assessing student achievements is mainly clear, public and appropriate to assess the learning outcomes. However the review team recommend that the criteria used to assess the thesis project (SER p32) be reviewed and rewritten to ensure that criteria are achievable by the students. For example for if an artwork being assessed is *not* potentially socially oriented, can the student pass that criteria? Specialty work assessment examination is carried out by displaying work in communal academic spaces for 5 days (and public if needed). The review team applauds that students from all years show their work together, and external invites are extended, as this provides a collective context for high quality critical discussion as described in the SER (p32). The review team understands this as good practice for peer learning. According to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania and the Study Regulations of VAA a 10-point criterion grading scale is used (SER p31).

The review team confirm that the professional activities of the majority of programme graduates correspond to the expectations of the programme and employers including social partners. This is evidenced by the meetings the review teams held during the visit with social partners and alumni and in the table of graduate destinations in the SER (p34) that show that all but one of 23 responders is working in the art field and/or self-employed. Equally the review team confirm that the programme corresponds to the state economic, social and cultural and future development needs. However, this sector is complex and the review team is reassured to read some analysis of the sector drivers by the programme team in the SER (p10) that establishes an understanding of the way in which an art school cannot blindly follow trends, but establishes ways to develop graduates who are agile, quick thinking and able to adapt to the professional context.

The review team confirm that a fair learning environment is ensured and note that VAA is subject to a Code of Academic Ethics (SER p5). The review team read and heard of examples of students raising concerns (complaints) and the methods by which those concerns are gathered, addressed, and solutions fed back to students. It is clear to the review team that informal and direct consultations are better received by the students than the formal questionnaires and the review team recommends that the administration of VAA, whilst using anonymous questionnaires, should maintain more effective ways of official feedback.



## 2.6. Programme management

The process of study programme administration and quality assurance is regulated by the Study Regulations of VAA (SER pp35). In terms of the Quality Assessment Assurance Policy the Study Programme Committee works well and in addition to addressing academic and operational matters through monitoring and implementation of change, pertaining to the department, the committee also receives matters and decisions from VAA Senate and the Faculty Council. It is valued by its members (listed p36), i.e. staff, social partners, alumni and one student who was in the SER meeting, but other students the review team met were unaware of its function and the review team recommends that this is addressed. However, students clearly do influence change through informal dialogue with staff, so any formal processes should be 'light touch'.

In the meetings with the SER group and teachers the review team were told that the QA has helped the department to define what qualities it needed for a contemporary sculpture/art education and the studies were then diverted toward the results of this, which were agreed upon by student, academy, social partners and graduate representatives. This study programme can then be renewed/changed based upon reviewing the results of data collection and surveys, as well as previous evaluation recommendations.

The review team could see improvements made in response to the previous evaluation in 2008 such as the lack of computers in 2008 has been improved via the new Art and Design Lab which is a very positive addition to the Institution's facilities, where new technologies are gathered under one roof – a unified tech base that is interdisciplinary. This can only have a positive ripple effect into the artistic practice and conceptual thinking of the students – sculpture being a department where material and process are seen as conceptual phenomena. This attitude is highly supported by the review team, together with the collaborative initiative that the other VAA Campus's at Kaunas and Telsiai also have access (via on-line booking and visits). The social partner representative is a member of the Study Programme Committee, where formal input to the programme evaluation is also made, which addresses the suggestion from the previous evaluation in 2008 that - *more research could be of value to design a process of obtaining feedback from all stakeholders that may provide more valuable and constructive information.* Links with social partners, whether formal or informal (the review team note the contingent nature of these relationships referred to in the SER p38), are now very positive and working well. The social partners were very positive on the ambitions of the graduates. Being the capital and centre of the Lithuanian art scene, naturally many of the social partners are galleries - both State and Independent: CAC, AV17, Meno Nisa Gallery,

the Art Vilnius Art Fair all in particular supporting student and graduate exposure to curators, exhibitions, etc. One final example of a response to the previous evaluation is not so favourable - despite the hardwork done by the programme staff there appear to still be some issues in the relevance of the syllabus of the art history subject that was raised by the review team in 2008 - *the department of Sculpture have little if any influence on in particular, the theory teaching in the humanities education* (see 2.2 above).

Quantitative and qualitative information about the study programme is easily accessible to the public and potential applicants through the website of the Sculpture Department the VAA (SER p26) and the academic information system of the VAA, in publications and annual study fairs, and in booklets (SER p26). The review team congratulates the department for their successful admissions strategies that ensures a consistently healthy student cohort – both in quality and numbers, though it is noted that the department would welcome higher student numbers and so needs to continue to develop strategies to attract them. The review team commends work done by VAA towards attaining an exemption from the New State Admissions Regulation, which if successful, will greatly enhance admissions for the arts programmes.

Data and other information regarding programme implementation are collected and analysed periodically, as evidenced in the SER, e.g. graduate destinations and careers, teaching staff profiles, application numbers and student opinions in surveys, online and informal through reviews and face-to-face meetings (see 2.5). Internal quality assurance that involves student opinion requires an overall level of trust between the student, the teacher and the institution (SER p37), which appears to be present in the informal levels of sharing opinions in the sculpture department.

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

## *2.7. Examples of excellence*

1. The review team commend the programme for its clear focus on performing artistic research.
2. The review team commend the department staff on the way they have mobilised their resources to address the theoretical gap through invited artists, critics and other cultural commentators and Investigation Bureau.
3. The review team commend the Faculty on the improvements made since the last evaluation in 2008 with the new facilities in the VAA Art and Design Laboratory.
4. The review team commends work done by VAA towards attaining an exemption from the New State Admissions Regulation, which if successful, will greatly enhance admissions for the arts programmes.
5. The review team commend the department that the graduates and students of are highly involved in the creative sector in Lithuania and internationally, and actively participate in mobility opportunities

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The review team recommends that the programme could involve more collaborative, socially engaged and contextual thinking projects (all very current art zones), which might then have a positive impact for students to become increasingly socially inclined.
2. The review team also recommends that a greater degree of distinction between BA and MA programmes is necessary.
3. The review team recommends that the Faculty revisit the way that humanities subjects support the BA programme.
4. The review team recommends that the programme team revisit the issue of practical training.
5. The review team recommends that the Institution support the sculpture department with its connections to the City Municipality in relation toward gaining permission for artist-driven works in public space.
6. The review team recommends that the department initiate a subject or workshop with the input of social partners (preferably) to cover grant funding proposal writing, residency application writing, project proposal writing, and folio presentation.
7. The review team recommends that the department should discuss the balance of gender within the core teaching staff when there are forthcoming opportunities for new appointments.
8. While congratulating VAA and the Faculty on the implementation of the Systematic Professional Development of staff, the review team recommends further investment in made in supporting staff professional activities
9. The review team recommends that the issue of space allocation needs to be kept under review by the Faculty in relation to admissions numbers in the department
10. The review team recommend that the Administration should ensure that new acquisition wishes from the department was are taken into account by the library.
11. The review team recommend that the criteria used to assess the thesis project be reviewed and rewritten to ensure that criteria are achievable by the students.

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

#### **IV. SUMMARY**

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

The review team consider that the programme structure is in line with the legal requirements and the content of subjects corresponds to the Bachelors and first-cycle university studies in the arts. The review team found that the subjects of the study programme support the acquisition of students' skills in contemporary sculpture and valued the breadth of media and presentational approaches and the early focus on the 'contemporary'. The review team recommends that the programme team revisit the issue of practical training. The subjects of study are taught in a consistent manner in the studio and great effort has been made to ensure holistic learning. The review team commend the department staff on the way they have mobilised their resources to address the theoretical gap through invited artists, critics and other cultural commentators and Investigation Bureau. The review team recommends that the Faculty revisit the way that humanities subjects support the programme. The review team confirm students are able to achieve the intended outcomes and commend the programme for its clear focus on performing artistic research and student centred learning. The content of the programme corresponds to the latest academic, artistic or technological achievements through a curriculum that addresses recent technological advances and engages visiting artists and critics to foreground international debates, thereby complimenting the international profile of staff and supporting students' preparation for the global arts context. The

review team recommends that the department initiates a professional skills workshops specific to artists.

The review team confirm that the number of staff and their professional profiles meet the legal requirements. The qualifications of the teaching staff and the quality of student work evidence the high standards of teaching, and ensures that the learning outcomes are achievable. Certification is assessed every 5 years. The review team found that the involvement of students in selecting teachers encourages the motivation of staff whom constantly review their pedagogical approaches and subject content, so providing a high quality learning experience. The review team confirms that the turnover of teaching staff ensures provides vitality and renewal. Recent appointments have enhanced the breadth of input regarding contemporary ideas and art debates, including artistic research methods. The review team recognise a highly professional and motivated teaching staff, evidenced by the quality and range of student artwork, however the team suggests that gender balance among the core staff should be considered when next appointing new staff. The staff consistently develop their professional standing through high profile international conferences, exhibitions and cultural events. While congratulating VAA and the Faculty on the implementation of the Systematic Professional Development of staff, the review team recommends further investment in made. The strong links with social partners focuses on access to curatorial skills and exhibition networks and spaces, so supporting graduate aspirations.

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

The review team see that entrance requirements are long established, consistent and transparent, however the review team commends work done by VAA towards attaining an exemption from the New State Admissions Regulation. The review team discussed the reduction in graduates since 2012 with department staff and understand that there is potential for more students if resources follow, but the number of graduates is appropriate. The organisation of the study process (regulated by the Study Regulations of the Academy and approved at the start of the year) ensures proper implementation of the programme and achievement of the intended learning outcomes and

workload of study and exams are scheduled evenly across semesters and communicated well. It is to be commended that the graduates and students of the Sculpture Department are highly active in the creative sector in Lithuania and internationally and actively participate in mobility opportunities. The Programme ensures comprehensive communication and academic support for students, who are represented in a number of fora. The system of assessing student achievements is mainly clear, public and appropriate to assess the learning outcomes. However the review team recommend that the criteria used to assess the thesis project be rewritten to ensure that criteria are achievable. The professional activities of the majority of graduates relate to the art field and the review team see that the programme develops graduates who are agile, quick thinking and able to adapt to the professional context.

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



## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Sculpture* (state code – 612W10004) at Vilnius Art Academy is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

| No. | Evaluation Area                                    | Evaluation of an area in points* |
|-----|--|----------------------------------|
| 1.  | Programme aims and learning outcomes               | 4                                |
| 2.  | Curriculum design                                  | 3                                |
| 3.  | Teaching staff                                     | 4                                |
| 4.  | Facilities and learning resources                  | 4                                |
| 5.  | Study process and students' performance assessment | 3                                |
| 6.  | Programme management                               | 4                                |
|     | <b>Total:</b>                                      | <b>22</b>                        |

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

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

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

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

|                                 |                    |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| Grupės vadovas:<br>Team leader: | Sarah Bennett      |
| Grupės nariai:<br>Team members: | Eugenia Loginova   |
|                                 | Karen Harsbo       |
|                                 | Richard Launder    |
|                                 | Ms Asta Vaičiulytė |
|                                 | Ms Rūta Stankutė   |

**VILNIAUS DAILĖS AKADEMIJOS VILNIAUS FAKULTETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS  
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *SKULPTŪRA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612W10004) 2017-05-25  
EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-93 IŠRAŠAS**

&lt;...&gt;

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Vilniaus dailės akademijos Vilniaus fakulteto studijų programa *Skulptūra* (valstybinis kodas – 612W10004) vertinama **teigiamai**.

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

\* 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)

&lt;...&gt;

**IV. REKOMENDACIJOS**

1. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja į studijų programą įtraukti daugiau bendrų, socialiai atsakingų ir kontekstinį mąstymą skatinančių projektų (visų dabartinių meno zonų). Tai galėtų turėti teigiamos įtakos studentams, skatinti juos būti socialiai atsakingus.
2. Ekspertų grupė taip pat rekomenduoja bakalauro studijų programą labiau atskirti nuo magistrantūros studijų programos.

3. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja fakultetui apsvarstyti, kaip humanitariniai dalykai padeda vykdyti bakalauro studijų programą.
4. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja studijų programos komandai iš naujo apsvarstyti praktinio mokymo klausimą.
5. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja akademijai labiau palaikyti Skulptūros katedrą ir pasitelkus ryšius su miesto savivaldybe padėti gauti leidimą meninei veiklai viešojoje erdvėje.
6. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja katedrai inicijuoti dalyką ar seminarą, kuriame dalyvautų socialiniai partneriai (pageidautina) ir kuriame būtų kalbama apie prašymo gauti finansavimą rašymą, prašymo gauti gyvenamąsias patalpas pildymą, projektinio pasiūlymo rašymą ir atliktų darbų aplanko pristatymą.
7. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja katedrai apsvarstyti pagrindinės dėstytojų komandos lyčių pusiausvyrą, kai bus numatyta priimti naujų darbuotojų.
8. Ekspertų grupė sveikina VDA ir fakultetą įdiegus personalo profesinio tobulėjimo sistemą ir rekomenduoja skirti lėšų, kurios padėtų gerinti dėstytojų profesinę veiklą.
9. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja stebėti erdvių paskirstymą, atsižvelgiant į studijuoti priimtųjų skaičių katedroje.
10. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja administracijai užtikrinti, kad biblioteka įsigydama naujų leidinių atsižvelgtų į katedros pageidavimus ir poreikius.
11. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja iš naujo apsvarstyti baigiamųjų darbų projektų vertinimo kriterijus ir juos perrašyti taip, kad studentai galėtų jų laikytis.
12. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja VDA administracijai ieškoti veiksmingesnių anoniminių apklausų formalaus grįžtamojo ryšio pateikimo būdų.
13. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja katedrai užtikrinti, kad visi studentai suprastų Studijų programos komiteto vaidmenį ir savo indėlį, kurį gali duoti.

<...>

## V. SANTRAUKA

Ekspertų grupės nuomone, bakalauro studijų programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai yra gerai apibrėžti ir aiškūs. Jie yra viešai skelbiami interneto svetainėje ([www.vda.lt](http://www.vda.lt)) ir ypač atitinka studentų, absolventų ir socialinių partnerių poreikius. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja į studijų programą įtraukti daugiau bendrų, socialiai atsakingų ir kontekstinį mąstymą skatinančių projektų. Ekspertai taip pat nori rekomenduoti, kad VDA paremtų Skulptūros katedrą, pasinaudotų ryšiais su miesto savivaldybe ir gautų leidimą menininkams dirbti viešojoje erdvėje. Pagrindinį studijų programos uždavinį parengti šiuolaikinius (skulptūros) menininkus, turinčius savo meninį identitetą ir pasirengusius pavaizduoti ir dalyvauti vietos ir tarptautinėje meno veikloje, patvirtina studentų darbų kokybė ir įvairovė, taip pat parodos. Tai atitinka absolventų profesinius reikalavimus. Studentai pasižymi savarankišku mokymusi ir atsakomybe už savo meninę kryptį; šiuos bruožus padėjo išsiugdyti dėstytojų pedagoginis požiūris į šiuolaikinio meno sritį. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja labiau atskirti bakalauro ir magistrantūros studijas, tai reiškia, kad reikia aiškiau apibrėžti kiekvienos studijų programos tapatybę, ypač nustatyti tinkamą turinį, skirtumus ir kokybės lūkesčius. Vis dėlto studijų programa atitinka studijų pirmosios pakopos reikalavimus, o kvalifikacijų lygis yra panašus į kitas, ekspertų grupei žinomas, bakalauro studijų programas.

Ekspertų grupė mano, kad studijų programos sandara atitinka teisės aktų nustatytus reikalavimus, dalykų turinys atitinka bakalauro ir pirmosios pakopos universitetines meno studijas. Ekspertų grupė nustatė, kad studijų programos dalykai padeda studentams įgyti šiuolaikinės skulptūros įgūdžių, ekspertai vertina medijų ir pristatymo metodų įvairovę bei tai, kad daug dėmesio skiriama šiuolaikiškumui. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja studijų programos personalui iš naujo apsvarstyti praktinio mokymo klausimą. Studijų dalykai dėstomi nuosekliai studijoje, dedama daug pastangų holistiniam mokymuisi užtikrinti. Ekspertų grupė nori pagirti katedros personalą už tai, kaip gerai sutelkti ištekliai teorijos spragoms užpildyti, pasikvietus menininkų, kritikų ir kitų kultūros apžvalgininkų bei pasitelkus Tyrimo biurą. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja fakultetui iš naujo apsvarstyti, kaip humanitariniai dalykai galėtų sustiprinti studijų programą. Ekspertų grupė patvirtina, kad studentai gali pasiekti numatytus studijų rezultatus, ir giria studijų programą už aiškiai į meno mokslinius tyrimus ir į studentų orientuotą mokymąsi sutelktą dėmesį. Studijų programos turinys atitinka naujausius akademinus, meninius ar technologinius laimėjimus, nagrinėjami pastarojo meto technologiniai pasiekimai, įtraukiami kviestiniai menininkai ir kritikai, kurie dalyvauja tarptautiniuose debatuose ir taip prisideda prie dėstytojų tarptautinio profilio, padeda studentams pasirengti darbui pasaulinio meno kontekste. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja katedrai inicijuoti profesinių įgūdžių darbo seminarus, skirtus menininkams.

Ekspertų grupė patvirtina, kad personalo skaičius ir profesinė kvalifikacija atitinka teisinės aktų nustatytus reikalavimus. Dėstytojų kvalifikacija ir studentų darbų kokybė rodo aukštus dėstytojų standartus ir užtikrina studijų rezultatų pasiekiamumą. Atestacija atliekama kas 5 metus. Ekspertų grupė nustatė, kad studentų dalyvavimas atrenkant dėstytojus skatina dėstytojų, kurių ugdymo metodai ir dalyko turinys yra nuolat peržiūrimi, motyvaciją, tai leidžia užtikrinti kokybišką mokymąsi. Ekspertų grupė patvirtina, kad dėstytojų kaita užtikrina programos gyvybingumą ir atnaujinimą. Naujausi dėstytojų paskyrimai sustiprina šiuolaikinių idėjų ir debatų apie meną indėlio įvairovę, įskaitant meninių mokslinių tyrimų metodus. Ekspertų grupė pripažįsta, kad dėstytojai yra labai profesionalūs ir motyvuoti, tai patvirtina studentų meno kūrinių kokybė ir įvairovė, tačiau ekspertai siūlo prieš skiriant naujus dėstytojus atsižvelgti į pagrindinio personalo lyčių pusiausvyrą. Personalas nuolat gilina savo profesines žinias aukšto lygio tarptautinėse konferencijose, parodose ir kultūros renginiuose. Ekspertų grupė sveikina VDA ir fakultetą įdiegus dėstytojų profesinio tobulėjimo sistemą ir rekomenduoja toliau investuoti į žinių gilinimą. Tvirti ryšiai su socialiniais partneriais užtikrina prieigą prie kuratorių ir parodų tinklų bei erdvių, o tai padeda absolventams įgyvendinti savo siekius.

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

Ekspertų grupė mato, kad priėmimo reikalavimai yra nusistovėję, nuoseklūs ir skaidrūs, teigiamai vertina VDA atliktą darbą siekiant, kad būtų atleisti nuo naujų valstybės priėmimo taisyklių. Ekspertų grupė su katedros darbuotojais aptarė absolventų skaičiaus sumažėjimą nuo 2012 m. ir supranta, kad, jei būtų išteklių, studentų skaičių būtų galima padidinti, tačiau absolventų skaičius yra tinkamas. Studijų eigos organizavimas (kurį reglamentuoja Akademijos studijų nuostatai, tvirtinami metų pradžioje) užtikrina tinkamą studijų programos vykdymą ir numatomų studijų rezultatų pasiekiamumą bei studijų ir egzaminų krūvį, kurie vienodai paskirstyti per semestrus. Informavimas apie tai yra tinkamas. Reikia pasidžiaugti, kad Skulptūros katedros absolventai ir studentai aktyviai dalyvauja kūrybinėje veikloje Lietuvoje ir tarptautiniu mastu bei aktyviai išnaudoja judumo galimybes. Studijų programa užtikrina visapusišką bendravimą ir akademinę paramą studentams, kurie akademijai atstovauja įvairiuose forumuose. Studentų pasiekimų vertinimo sistema iš esmės yra aiški, viešai skelbiama ir tinkama studijų rezultatams įvertinti. Tačiau ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja perrašyti baigiamųjų projektų vertinimo kriterijus, kad jų būtų galima tinkamai laikytis. Daugelio absolventų profesinė veikla yra susijusi su meno sritimi, ir ekspertų grupė mato, kad studijų programa parengia absolventus, kurie yra aktyvūs, greitai mąsto ir geba prisitaikyti prie profesinio konteksto.

Kalbant apie kokybės vertinimo ir užtikrinimo politiką, Studijų programos komitetas gerai dirba, sprenddamas katedros akademinius ir einamuosius veiklos klausimus, stebi bei įgyvendina pokyčius. Studentai daro įtaką pokyčiams neoficialiai bendraudami su dėstytojais, tačiau turi tinkamai suprasti Studijų programos komiteto vaidmenį. Ekspertų grupė pastebi, kad atsižvelgiant į 2008 m. atliktą vertinimą buvo atnaujinta studijų programa ir išlaikyta jos kokybė. Socialinio partnerio atstovas yra Studijų programos komiteto narys ir dirbdamas taip pat formaliai prisideda prie studijų programos tobulinimo. Informacija apie studijų programą yra lengvai prieinama visuomenei ir potencialiems pareiškėjams VDA Skulptūros katedros interneto svetainėje. Ekspertų grupė giria katedrą už sėkmingą studentų priėmimo strategiją, kuri pastoviai užtikrina tinkamą studentų grupės kokybę ir dydį. Duomenys ir kita informacija apie studijų programos vykdymą periodiškai renkama ir analizuojama, pvz., renkama informacija apie absolventų užimtumą ir karjerą, dėstytojų profilius,

paraiškų skaičių ir studentų nuomones, kurias jie pateikia per apklausas. Ekspertų grupė mano, kad nuo paskutiniojo vertinimo ši studijų programa dar labiau sustiprėjo ir studentų bei absolventų teiginys, kad visi jie vadina save šiuolaikiniais menininkais, yra pagrindinis studijų programos sėkmės rodiklis. Skulptūros katedra iš esmės prisideda prie miesto ir šalies kultūrinio gyvenimo. Ekspertų grupė mato galimybių dar labiau prisidėti prie tarptautinio šiuolaikinio meno konteksto.

---

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)