



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Lietuvos muzikos ir teatro akademijos
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *TEATRO REŽISŪRA*
(valstybinis kodas – 621W41002)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF THEATRE DIRECTING (state code – 621W41002)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre

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 Klimiata,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator – Ms Eimantė Gečytė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2015

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Teatro režisūra</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621W41002
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis	Teatras ir kinas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Teatro magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1997-09-01

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Theatre Directing</i>
State code	621W41002
Study area	Art studies
Study field	Theatre and film
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Theatre
Date of registration of the study programme	01-09-1997

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process	4
1.2. General	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information	4
1.4. The Review Team	6
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	6
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	6
2.2. Curriculum design	7
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	21

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 the Lithuanian Music and Theatre Academy (LMTA): Theatre Directing MA were initiated by the Centre for Quality Assessment

in Higher Education of Lithuania nominating the external evaluation peer group identified below.

For the evaluation 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 for Master Degree 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 15th 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, graduates and stakeholders. The expert group evaluated various support services (classrooms, studios, library, computer facilities), examined students' final works, 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.

The Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre (hereinafter – LMTA) is a music, theatre, film and dance art university with a declared mission to ensure sustainable development of art and art research. The Academy is a state higher education institution and delivers study programmes in all three study cycles. There are two faculties in the Academy: the Faculty of Music and the Faculty of Theatre and Film. The Faculty of Theatre and Film consists of 4 departments: the Departments of Film and Television, Art History and Theory, Dance and Movement, Acting and Directing; as well as an Art Management Division. The delivery of the MA Directing Programme is coordinated by the Department of Acting and Directing. In all, the Faculty of Theatre and Film delivers 15 first-cycle (bachelor) and second-cycle (master) study programmes and doctoral studies in the field of Theatre and Film.

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 *15th 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 Second Cycle, MA in Theatre Directing was last evaluated in 2011 with 7 recommendations including greater integration of practical and academic skills, more interdisciplinary content and cooperation with the Musical department, greater academic exchange across countries. It is taught in a specialist academy (with State Higher Education University status) covering music, theatre, film and dance, organised into two faculties (Music and Theatre). This programme and the MA in Acting are housed in the Department of Acting and Directing.

The aim of the programme is to 'train theatre directing professionals of the highest qualification who are able to contribute significantly to the development of theatre art in the country through their creation, analytical and assessment skills' (p.6). This aim is consonant with professional requirements and the needs of the labour market and some data is provided in the SER to justify the industry need (p.9) The SER claims that the Programme's content is benchmarked against other Higher Education directing courses in Europe, but whilst there are a great number of bilateral agreements in place, the extent to which these can be considered active remains unclear and there was no explicit evidence of external benchmarking offered to the Assessment team (in terms of content or approaches to research) during the site visit. Given the 2011 recommendation for increased intercultural exchange, this was disappointing. The Programme aim is realised

through 11 Learning Outcomes considered first in terms of the common descriptors: Knowledge, Research, Special abilities, Social abilities and Personal abilities; and secondly mapped against the constituent Study Subjects for the two years of the programme. On paper, this mapping appears persuasive but in discussing the everyday experience of students on the programme, the individual components of the programme were not sufficiently identifiable and the coherence evident in the SER was not being experienced on the course. Students did not feel part of a research culture and, although they were supported in Research Basics, were not benefitting from the many Research-oriented activities undertaken by staff.

Both the Programme Aims and the learning outcomes are compliant with Lithuanian Qualifications Framework Level VII and the recognized Second Cycle of Studies of the Framework of Qualifications in the European HE area. Programme Aims and expected Learning outcomes are published on the AIKOS website, on the academy websites and through various 'study exhibitions' in Lithuania and abroad (p.6).

There were no areas identified as needing specific attention and/or further development and no weaknesses or strengths referred to explicitly in the summary statement of the section in the SER. However, the strength observed by the Assessment Team was in the individual autonomy afforded to students. Weaknesses include indistinct boundaries between the curriculum components as far as the student experience is concerned – for instance in the distinction between assessed work within the programme and work with a directing master beyond the programme; unrealised potential for research skills development; over dependency on the Year Leader determining the success of the Programme.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design of the Programme Theatre Directing meets the legal requirements that regulate such studies. In scope it consists of 120 credits, duration 2 years (requirement not less 90 and not more 120 credits). Subjects which have to be of a higher level in quality terms than the one taught in the first cycle programme consist of 70 credits (requirement at least 60 credits). Elective subjects, defined by the university and undertaken by the student, consist of 30 credits (requirement not more 30 credits). For the Master's Final work is allocated in total 55 credits: for Master's Art Project – 20 credits and for Directing which could be considered as Final examination – 35 credits (requirement for Final work or Final work and Final examination is not less 30 credits).

The programme is composed of modules (5-20 credits in scope) and the number of modules do not exceed 5 within a semester (requirement not more than 5 subjects during one semester). Only Sociology is left of 3 credits (Annex 1, p. 40). The subjects are organized evenly over the study semesters, per 30 credits in each semester. The scope of student's independent work is clearly more than 30 percent of the scope of each module / subject (requirement not less than 30 percent) (Annex 5).

To evaluate the relevance of the order of modules/subjects within the Study plan was complicated by the way in which information was presented to the Assessment Team. The reviewers received two versions of the Study plan of the programme Theatre Directing. One Study plan is in the Annex No. 5 (hereinafter – Old version), the other was received later and is formatted in Word (hereinafter – New version). During the visit it was hard to understand which Study plan should be considered valid. It was noted that the new version is closer to requirements; it has Elective subjects instead of the Alternatives of Applied Subject in the Old version. Also, the New version reaches a higher level of coherence and consistency, by integrating the modules into broad themes. The 1st semester concentrates on Directing and its relation to Film, the 2nd semester – on Directing, Drama and Postmodern Theatre, the 3rd semester – on Directing and Contemporary theatre, while the last, 4th semester – focuses on Master's Art Project and Practical training. Such integration in the curriculum seems to be logical and reasonable but, as stated above, was not evident in the students' experience. During the meetings with teachers and visiting the auditoriums the potential for interdisciplinary collaboration with music and film was evident but still not being fully exploited and, as this was also part of the last assessment team's recommendations, this should be reflected in further developments to the curriculum as matter of priority.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme are covered by the content of the modules / subjects. And the scope of the study programme is sufficient to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Mostly, the content of module / subject is clearly defined in its title and in the topics, as well, in the intended learning outcomes and criteria for evaluation. The content of modules, as descriptions show, has different themes and the themes commonly are thus not repetitive. But the themes of the subject Directing are almost the same during the semesters 1-3, moreover, the themes at the 3 semester are shown only two: 1) development of practical and theoretical skills of directing; 2) preparation of the final performance (Annex 1, p. 3), while the time for teaching is allocated 15 credits (p. 2). Some subjects reflect the latest achievements in art concretely (Drama Text Analysis and Interpretation, Postmodern Theatre,

Contemporary Theatre Artists), while the content of other subjects does this vaguely (Directing, Cultural Anthropology).

The biggest part of the content of the modules is consistent with the level of the studies at Master's level and ensure the assessment of higher competences in comparison with those which were achieved at the Bachelor's level. But some content remains close to Bachelor level as it has no articulated peculiarities specific to Master's level. For example, themes of the Directing: development of the practical and theoretical skills of directing; working with drama materials; working with the cast and crew; the process of creating a performance (Annex 1, p. 2-3. Overall, the lack of distinction between Bachelor's and Master's levels remained a theme during the meetings at the institution (sometimes the uniqueness of Master's studies was related to new professional environment in theatres or directing styles, but these were not referred specifically).

For teaching various methods are applied: lectures, seminars, presentations, discussions, individual creative projects. But the lists of references of some modules seem to be too small in scope (e.g., 2 books, Annex 1, p. 12), as well as in many descriptions there are no indications of books held in the institution's library.

As it was revealed during the meeting with teachers, the inclusion of the arts research in the curriculum started mainly due to the implementation of interdisciplinary projects. The need to increase the understanding of the significance of qualitative inquiry, as well as its inclusion into the bachelor's degree curriculum in order to prepare students for academic writing, was felt strongly during the visit.

In accordance with paragraph 21 of the Description of General Requirements for Master Study Programmes approved by the Order of the Minister of Education and Science of RL No. V-826 of 3 June 2010, the Master's final work in the area of art study must consist of a creative project and with this project concerned research paper which describes the new ideas, knowledge and technologies applied in the project. As can be seen from the description of Master's Art Project (Annex 1, p. 24-25), it mainly concerns the creation of a performance, while the research paper is left aside. Moreover, research paper is prepared in the III semester, whereas the Project – is in semester IV (Annex, 5; New version of Study plan), which led to an unnecessary separation of theoretical and practical thinking, which should be one of the defining characteristics of studies at Master level and especially of the Master's Final work according to the General Requirements for Master Study Programmes mentioned above. Meetings during the visit revealed a lack of

clarity concerning the parameters to which the Final thesis must comply, including those relating to assessment.

There were no identifiable strengths observed in this area. Weaknesses were the confused status of the curriculum paperwork; the lack of clarity over the final thesis assessment regime, and a remaining lack of distinction between BA and MA level curriculum demands.

2.3. Teaching staff

The staff component of the programme is robust, counting 12 teachers the majority of them being full-time teachers with long pedagogical and artistic careers and sufficient in principle to meet the Programme Learning Outcomes.

Teachers of this MA Programme have, in general, an impressive output, both in terms of artistic creation and research and some of them have been awarded in Lithuania and abroad. Teachers are appointed by public competition and their outcomes are surveyed annually, through a report informed by consistent indicators about research, artistic and pedagogical activities.

SER does not allow a precise evaluation about the individual workload of teachers (Annex 3 reports that activity as is required for a 5 year period). However, tables 11 to 13 indicate a precise and adequate proportion of work hours between pedagogical and artistic, research, methodological and organisational activities.

Also, through the data indicated in Annex 3, one can infer that there is a positive connection between artistic and research activities of teachers and the choice of subjects they are supposed to teach. SER indicates the fact that a good proportion of teachers are well established artists and professionals who play important roles in Lithuanian theatrical institutions has been a positive element in the development of student careers and projects after graduation. The visit partly confirmed this dynamic as the students are invited frequently to participate in the artistic production of their teachers. This practice, however, leads to an unhealthy lack of distinction between students' work on the Programme and their Professional work, which is exacerbated by the evident penury of material resources in the higher education institution. This results in a lack of Programme identity, reinforcing factors of stress and dissatisfaction among students (and particularly evident among alumni).

However scarce in number, some of the scientific publications and monographs written by teachers present a consistent interest in pedagogical subjects, which is a good indicator of the relation between artistic and pedagogical experiences. Some of this scientific production was adopted as mandatory literature in certain strategic courses of the Programme.

In what concerns teachers' scientific research, the Programme is capacitated but these capacities are not sufficiently developed or adequately structured. Substantial evidence of this lack of structure was vividly enunciated by actual and former students who did not feel prepared in terms of their research capabilities, even to accomplish their own research work. This lack of harmony between artistic and academic research and associated poverty of research culture is a major drawback of the Programme, especially considering the central position of LMTA among Lithuanian artistic institutions.

SER presents an interesting and potentially dynamic "Distribution of the Academy staff by age groups". No precise information is provided in what concerns the turnover of teachers, being only stated in SER (p. 20) that: "The analysis of the turnover of Programme teachers revealed that it is functional, i.e. teachers who do not achieve sufficient quality in their work leave the Academy, it is also controlled, i.e. depends on the factors that are influenced by the top management of the Academy and Faculty." Considering, however, the data presented in Annex 2 (List of Programme teachers), experts' group considers that the distribution of teachers is well balanced and that the Programme is not threatened by a sudden lack of teaching staff.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

As identified in the SER and clarified during the site visit, there are ambitious plans for a new campus which will consolidate the many separate spaces of LMTA into one, whilst retaining some of the recently refurbished Music spaces. These plans inevitably slow the pace of improvement in the other existing buildings and the accommodation for students on the MA programmes is still in development. Improvements have been made since the last review when resources were identified as needing serious and immediate attention. A suite of small training theatres were moderately well equipped and in the main building a space "designated for the MAs" was nearing completion – with a lighting rig to be installed. This renovation programme for older spaces has been undertaken over the last few years and in total five studios have been refurbished since the previous evaluation. EU structural funds have been used strategically to develop these resources. In size and quality this resource base is sufficient for students' studies but, as stated below, there was little evidence of students using it. Access to these facilities for

the students is exceptionally generous with weekend and evening access provided, as well as the possibility to work on National holidays. The site visit facilitated access to these spaces to flesh out the descriptions in Section 4 of the SER.

According to the SER the Music Innovation Studies Centre is available for the purposes of the delivery of the programme. Whilst this Centre is impressive and very well equipped, there was no evidence of its use by MA Theatre Directing students. Indeed, there was a strong sense from the programme team that, even with the new designated studio for MAs, spaces beyond the Academy were more appropriate for the post grads; that is to say theatres run by members of the Programme team. The benefits for students of working directly in established theatres are not to be overlooked, but there remained a sense for the Assessment Team of a divided resource base, adding to the impression that there remain indistinct boundaries between work within the programme and work outside.

Learning resources are housed in the LMTA library and include generous book stock observed by the Assessment Team. The SER identifies subscriptions to a large number of e-databases (18 in total), including a number of international e-publishing houses. There is a designated reading room for students to access a repository of video recordings. LMTA teachers also are active in producing methodological material for study by students. The programme team assess the learning resources as being improved on a 'consistent and continuous' basis (p.27). A Moodle platform to support students' studies is used, although the extent to which it facilitates a 'distance' mode is unclear.

Strengths observed by the experts' team for this section include the implementation of a strategy since the last evaluation for developing the spaces and overall resource base. Weaknesses are related to the extent to which these improvements are impacting on the Theatre Directing students and the pedagogically indistinct separation of Programme-related spaces from those associated with outside partners.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The admission requirements appear to be well founded and described. Applicants to the Master Programme of Theatre Directing are required to have a university bachelor degree in Theatre and Film. Then they enter a contest whose rules are quite clear and explicit. The contest is organised by calculating individual contest marks for the participants, which consists of the assessment of a speciality entrance examination (0.6), the average of the learning outcomes in the first study

cycle (0.2), a creative written assignment (0.2). The competitive scores of the entrants are high and stable.

During the study process, the students are encouraged to participate in a range of practical activities associated with Directing, including managing a cast and play analysis. Given the particular needs of a postgraduate cohort, timetables of lectures were described as not always convenient for students (it would be more convenient if all or most lectures would be on the same day). Contrary to what is written in the SER, the timetable was not agreed upon by students at the beginning of the semester.

Only a small part of teaching/learning methods mentioned at the SER (debate, discussions, team work, projects, self-evaluation and role plays) are used for achievement of the learning outcomes and this range of opportunities was not known to the students.

Students have many possibilities for showing their creative works in Lithuanian theatres and festivals. Students participate in the above activities together with teachers, so their engagement is smooth and natural. There is evidence of involvement in the life of Lithuanian theatre already while studying. However, students' research work in written form is only partially supported, and graduates reported that they were seriously under prepared when the written part of the Final Thesis had to be constructed; they were offered a lot of examples, but the teaching of explicit research methodologies and writing approaches were not sufficient for Masters level achievement. In addition, there was no sense of a research culture or groupings into which MA Directing students could fit and within which they could feel supported. This testimony does not accord with that reported in SER.

In the assessment period, one Master student of Theatre Directing went for Erasmus practice. There were no incoming students. The main reason why students avoid participation in mobility programmes is that they were too involved in creative projects and working in theatres already while studying. Whilst students did not report this as a drawback, the lack of aspiration of the students and the seeming lack of opportunity within the programme was a concern for the assessment team. It does not suggest a proactive response from the Academy in terms of the previous expert team's recommendations in 2011.

All academic information is provided for the students through first-year student introductory days, the website of the Academy, associated documents and via email. Consultations and

assistance in searching for required information is provided by teachers and in the library of the Academy. Students are full of ideas for project development but many could not begin to be materialized because of a lack of financial support.

The evaluation and marking of the students are not explained in detail at SER and were not clear in the visit.

All seven graduates have jobs according to their speciality (at National Drama Theatre, the Youth Theatre, etc.). However, some graduates reported that LAMT was not seriously committed to supporting students after graduation.

Strengths of this area are students' independence and autonomy as well as their involvement into practical activity from the beginning. Weaknesses are reflected in the need to increase research methods support and to resolve the indistinct boundaries between work within the programme and practice outside.

2.6. Programme management

It should be mentioned that Theatre Directing and Acting programmes are intertwined in many aspects; therefore it is quite clear that their respective managements coincide and have similar strengths and weaknesses.

Between 2012 and 2014, following the recommendations of an external evaluation carried out in 2011, the Lithuanian Music and Theatre Academy implemented a quality management system, pointed out the core processes (Studies and Lifelong Learning, Art activities, Research activities), edited a Quality Manual and distributed responsibilities and tasks in decision-making among individuals and committees. Surveys of students', graduates' and other stakeholders' opinions were carried out in 2014, but not finished before handing over of the SER, which means that many data could not be analysed and interpreted. During the site visit the assessment team asked questions about the way in which surveys of the study process were carried out among students, but the answers did not show clearly how concrete measures were taken; nevertheless, the experts' team believes that student surveys are carried out regularly. The LMTA works with a surprisingly large number of indicators, some of which are based on hard data and others on more subjective evaluations (especially indicators of satisfaction). It is evident that the academy uses data and analyses relevant time series and evolutions (applications, admissions, dropouts, graduations).

According to the SER, the main responsibility for the quality of study processes lies in the hands of Study Programme Committees, whose functioning is described in the Rules of Study Programme Committees of LMTA (existing only in the original Lithuanian version). Nevertheless, it is the *individual* responsibility and care for quality that is mentioned at the same time as one of the main principles of the Academy: “The responsibility for content and quality of instruction of individual study subjects as well as methodological measures is born by the teachers of the Academy” (SER, p. 38). The role of the individual is even more stressed in the case of the year leader, an individual “who is entrusted with the right to select a group of 1st years students, teaches core speciality subjects and is responsible for the overall training” (SER, *ibid.*); clear information on the way year leaders are appointed (by whom and according to what criteria) was not provided, but it can be deduced that personalities with undeniable artistic prestige are generally chosen. Although traditional arts schools build their methodology on a “master-pupil” system, the relationship between a strong year leader (artist) and the Programme Committee/Head of Department (representing a HE institution rather than the artistic milieu) should have clear rules. In fact, given the importance and the power of the year leader, students’ surveys should include not only evaluation of individual subjects, but also the progression within the programme and the satisfaction with the year leader’s overall methods and pedagogical/methodological choices.

The site visit and discussions with various groups of respondents showed more examples of the importance an individual can have within the system and pedagogical process: students’ wish for further specialization seem to be satisfied through *ad hoc* solutions (such as assisting another, more experienced teacher in order to acquire experience in theatre pedagogy), which the expert team does not consider as sustainable and methodologically relevant. The independence and self-reliance of students is, on one hand, a good simulation of real-life conditions, but sometimes there seem to be systemic flaws and situations are often resolved through non-systemic means (for example directing students look themselves for actors with whom to work). This relative instability and flimsiness of student experience should be one of the issues for the management team.

The programme management collaborates with external stakeholders to quite a large extent, as many students already work in professional theatres with professional actors; still, that means that it is sometimes difficult to make a clear distinction between a higher education institution work, which is still part of a learning process and should be assessed as such (in terms of

learning outcomes and student experience), and a professional arts work. The *ad hoc* system seems to be applied throughout the school whenever there is no systemized approach, with, for example, the year leader devoting more energy to students who do not succeed to find work in professional theatres, rather than to those who do; the question of equitable study experience and criteria for assessment should be raised at this point.

The management of the academy should be commended for its recent proactive approach towards internationalization. A post of international coordinator was created and events including international experts organized, which is a sign of a positive energy and an attempt at opening the school to different influences; still, there should probably be better promotion of such events, as students seem not to be sufficiently aware of them. Similarly, they have small awareness of the possibilities of studying abroad via Erasmus+ programme, arguing that it is difficult for them to leave their study process. Given the relative freedom they have, and the loose structure of the curriculum, this argument is rather surprising and the expert team encourages the school to look for suitable forms of international institutional cooperation (common projects, exchange of good practice etc.).

The internal quality assurance system was introduced between 2012 and 2014 at LMTA; a few weeks before the visit the English version of the Quality Manual was provided to the experts. The site visit showed that concrete measures are still being implemented, and that some of the teaching staff were not yet completely familiar with them. It is still early to judge the degree of the effectiveness and efficiency of the system.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To address directly and unambiguously, the lack of clarity over the parameters to which the Final Thesis must comply in explicit and transparent student-centred documentation.
2. To define unambiguously, the relationship between the Study Programme Committee and the Year Leader, in terms of their appointment and their on-going accountability, ensuring parity of experience for all students.
3. To increase the research methods and critical writing support for Final Thesis and to consider seriously the implications of this development on Bachelors provision.
4. To define and build a clear research environment and culture for MA students to mix with other academic researchers in projects and in symposia.
5. To determine clear and distinct boundaries between work within the programme and practice outside including the appropriate use of refurbished LMTA spaces.
6. To find a series of strategies to harness students' energies and ambitions and to capitalise upon their entrepreneurship both within the MA programme and after graduation.
7. To develop an effective strand of management skills training for students creating their own troupes.
8. To continue to work to define the distinction between Bachelors and Masters both for students and for stakeholders.
9. To firm up all programme regulations and assessment procedures and make explicit criteria in all documentation.
10. To enhance information about, and support for, students' international opportunities (e.g. Erasmus+).
11. To widen the stakeholder community and consider more extensive use of external assessors across the programme's activities.
12. To consider more generous financial support for MA student work.

IV. SUMMARY

This, Second Cycle, MA in Theatre Directing at LMTA was last evaluated in 2011 with 7 recommendations including greater integration of practical and academic skills, more interdisciplinary content and cooperation with the Musical department, greater academic exchange across countries. It is taught in a specialist academy (with State Higher Education University status) covering music, theatre, film and dance, organised into two faculties (Music and Theatre). This programme and the MA in Acting are housed in the Department of Acting and Directing.

In discussing the everyday experience of students on the programme, the individual components of the programme were not sufficiently identifiable and the coherence evident in the SER was not being experienced on the course. Students did not feel part of a research culture and, although they were supported in Research Basics, were not benefitting from the many Research-oriented activities undertaken by staff. In terms of the Aims of the programme, a strength observed by the Assessment Team was the individual creativity and entrepreneurial spirit of the students. Weaknesses include an indistinct set of curriculum components as far as the student experience is concerned; unrealised potential for research skills development and an over-dependency on the Year Leader determining the success of the Programme.

To evaluate the relevance of the order of modules/subjects within the Study plan was complicated by the way in which information was presented to the Assessment Team. The reviewers received two versions of the Study plan of the programme Theatre Directing. During the visit it was hard to understand which Study plan should be considered valid. Some content and methods of the modules are consistent with the level of the studies at Master's level ensuring the assessment of higher competences. But some content remains close to Bachelor level as it has no articulated peculiarities (for example, Annex 1, p. 16. "The tempo and rhythm of a stage act"). Overall, the lack of distinction between Bachelor's and Master's levels remained a theme during the meetings at the institution. During the meetings with teachers and visiting the auditoriums the potential for interdisciplinary collaboration with music and film was evident but still not being fully exploited and, as this was also part of the last assessment team's recommendations, this should be reflected in further developments to the curriculum as matter of priority.

Teachers on this MA Programme have, in general, an impressive output, both in terms of artistic creation and research and some of them have been awarded in Lithuania and abroad. Teachers

are appointed by public competition and their outcomes are surveyed annually, through a report informed by consistent indicators about research, artistic and pedagogical activities. In terms of teachers' scientific research, the Programme is capacitated but these capacities are not sufficiently developed or adequately structured. Substantial evidence of this was vividly enunciated by actual and former students who did not feel prepared in terms of their research capabilities to accomplish their own research work. This lack of harmony between artistic and scientific research and associated poverty of research culture is a major drawback of the Programme, especially considering the central position of LMTA among Lithuanian artistic institutions.

In terms of facilities, strengths observed by the experts' team include the implementation of a strategy since the last evaluation for developing the spaces and overall resource base. Weaknesses are related to the extent to which these improvements are impacting on the MA Theatre Directing students and the pedagogically indistinct separation of Programme-related spaces from those associated with outside partners.

Only a small part of teaching/learning methods mentioned in the SER (debate, discussions, team work, projects, self-evaluation and role plays) are used for the achievement of the learning outcomes. Students did not appear to be aware of these alternatives. In the assessment period, one Masters student of Theatre Directing went for Erasmus practice. There were no incoming students. The main reason why students avoid participation in mobility programmes is that they were actively involved in creative projects and working in theatres already while studying. All seven graduates have jobs according to their speciality (at National Drama Theatre, the Youth Theatre, etc.). However, some graduates reported that LAMT was not seriously committed to supporting students after graduation.

According to the SER, the main responsibility for the quality of study processes lies in the hands of Study Programme Committees. Nevertheless, it is the individual responsibility and care for quality that is mentioned as one of the main principles of the Academy (SER, p. 38). The role of the individual is even more stressed in the case of the Year Leader. Clear information on the way Year Leaders are appointed (by whom and according to what criteria) was not provided, but it can be deduced that personalities with an undeniable artistic prestige are generally chosen. The assessment team felt that the relationship between a strong Year Leader and the Programme Committee/Head of Department (representing a HE institution rather than the artistic milieu) should have clear rules and accountability systems.

The management of the academy should be commended for its recent proactive approach towards internationalization. A post of international coordinator was created and events including international experts organized. However, students seem not to be sufficiently aware of them and are resistant to the possibilities of studying abroad via Erasmus+ programme, arguing that it is difficult for them to leave their study process. The expert team encourages the school to look for suitable forms of international institutional cooperation (common projects, exchange of good practice etc.).

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Theatre Directing* (state code – 621W41002) at Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre 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	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	2
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	2
	Total:	13

*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

**LIETUVOS MUZIKOS IR TEATRO AKADEMIJOS ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ
PROGRAMOS *TEATRO REŽISŪRA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621W41002)
2015-06-25 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-173 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Lietuvos muzikos ir teatro akademijos studijų programa *Teatro režisūra* (valstybinis kodas – 621W41002) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	2
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	13

* 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

LMTA vykdoma antrosios pakopos magistrantūros studijų programa *Teatro režisūra* paskutinį kartą vertinta 2011 metais. Tuomet buvo pateiktos 7 rekomendacijos dėl didesnės praktinių ir akademinų gebėjimų integracijos, daugiau tarpdalykiškumo ir bendradarbiavimo su Muzikos katedra, aktyvesnių akademinų mainų skirtingose šalyse. Programą vykdo profesionali akademija (turinti valstybinės aukštosios mokyklos universiteto statusą), apimanti muzikos,

teatro, kino ir šokio studijas dviejuose fakultetuose (Muzikos ir Teatro). Ši studijų programa ir magistrantūros programa *Vaidyba* vykdoma Vaidybos ir režisūros katedroje.

Aptariant kasdienę studentų patirtį, susijusią su programa, nebuvo lengva nustatyti atskirus programos komponentus, o savianalizės suvestinėje akivaizdaus ryšio nepastebėta. Studentai nesijautė mokslinių tyrimų kultūros dalimi ir, nors dėstomas dalykas *Tiriamąjo darbo pagrindai*, naudos iš į mokslinius tyrimus orientuotos veiklos, kurią vykdo dėstytojai, negauna. Kalbant apie programos tikslus, vertinimo grupė pastebėjo privalumą – studentų individualaus kūrybiškumo ir verslumo dvasią. Pastebėta ir silpnybių: neaiškus studijų turinio komponentų rinkinys, susijęs su studentų patirtimi, nerealizuotas mokslinių tyrimų įgūdžių ugdymo potencialas ir egzistuoja pernelyg didelė priklausomybė nuo kurso vadovo nustatant programos sėkmę.

Buvo sunku įvertinti modulių (dalykų) aktualumą studijų plane remiantis tuo, kaip ekspertų grupei buvo pateikta informacija. Ekspertai gavo dvi programos *Teatro režisūra* studijų plano versijas. Vizito metu buvo sunku suprasti, kuris studijų planas galioja. Dalis modulių (dalykų) turinio ir metodai atitinka magistrantūros studijų lygį, užtikrinantį aukštesnių kompetencijų vertinimą. Tačiau tam tikra turinio dalis išlieka artima bakalauro studijų lygiui, nes nėra išreikšti ypatumai (pavyzdžiui, 1 priedo 16 p. „Sceninio veiksmo tempas ir ritmas“). Apskritai skirtumo tarp bakalauro ir magistro lygio studijų trūkumas buvo diskutuojamas akademijoje vykusiuose susitikimuose. Per susitikimus su dėstytojais ir lankantis auditorijose buvo pastebimas akivaizdus tarpdalykinio muzikos ir kino dalykų bendradarbiavimo potencialas, kuris vis dar nėra iki galo išnaudotas. Šis klausimas buvo įtrauktas ir į paskutiniojo vertinimo rekomendacijas. Jį reikėtų spręsti plėtojant studijų turinį ir teikti tam prioritetą.

Šios magistrantūros studijų programos dėstytojų pasiekimai įspūdingi tiek meninės kūrybos, tiek mokslinių tyrimų prasme, kai kurie dėstytojai apdovanoti Lietuvoje ir užsienyje. Dėstytojai skiriami viešojo konkurso būdu, jų rezultatai kasmet tikrinami ir rengiama ataskaita, kurioje nurodomi atitinkami mokslinių tyrimų, meninės ir pedagoginės veiklos rodikliai. Kalbant apie dėstytojų mokslinius tyrimus, programa turi pajėgumą, tačiau jie nėra pakankamai išplėtoti ir tinkamai struktūrizuoti. Pakankamai to įrodymų pateikė dabartiniai ir buvę studentai – jie neįjautė esantys pasirengę atlikti tiriamuosius darbus, kalbant apie mokslinių tyrimų gebėjimus. Harmonijos tarp meno ir mokslinių tyrimų stoka ir su tuo susijęs mokslinių tyrimų kultūros trūkumas yra pagrindinė programos silpnybė, ypač atsižvelgiant į centrinę LMTA poziciją tarp Lietuvos meno institucijų.

Kalbant apie materialiąją bazę, ekspertų grupė pastebėjo šias stiprybes: po paskutinio vertinimo sukurta patalpų ir bendros išteklių bazės gerinimo strategija. Silpnybės susijusios su tuo, kokią poveikį šie patobulinimai daro magistrantūros studijų programos *Teatro režisūra* studentams, be to, pedagogine prasme neaiškus su programa susijusių erdvių atskyrimas nuo tų erdvių, kurios susijusios su išorės partneriais.

Tik nedidelė dalis savianalizės suvestinėje minėtų dėstymo (mokymosi) metodų (debatai, diskusijos, komandinis darbas, projektas, įsivertinimas ir vaidmenys) naudojami siekiant studijų rezultatų. Neatrodė, kad studentai būtų informuoti apie šias alternatyvas. Vertinimo laikotarpiu vienas magistrantūros studijų programos *Teatro režisūra* studentas išvyko atlikti praktikos pagal *Erasmus*. Atvykusių studentų nebuvo. Pagrindinė priežastis, kodėl studentai vengia dalyvauti judumo programose, yra tai, kad jie aktyviai dalyvauja kūrybiniuose projektuose ir dar studijuodami dirba teatruose. Visi septyni absolventai turi darbą pagal specialybę (Nacionaliniame dramos teatre, Jaunimo teatre ir kt.). Tačiau kai kurie absolventai pareiškė, kad LMTA nelabai pasiryžusi padėti studentams po baigimo.

Pagal savianalizės suvestinę už studijų procesų kokybę daugiausia atsako studijų programų komitetai. Nepaisant to, tarp pagrindinių akademijos principų minima individuali atsakomybė ir rūpinimasis kokybe (SS, 38 p.). Dar labiau pabrėžiamas kurso vadovo asmeninis vaidmuo. Aiškios informacijos, kaip skiriamas kurso vadovas (kas skiria ir pagal kokius kriterijus), nepateikta, tačiau galima daryti išvadą, kad paprastai pasirenkamos nepaneigiamą meninį prestižą turinčios asmenybės. Ekspertų grupė mano, kad ryšys tarp stipraus kurso vadovo ir studijų programos komiteto ar katedros vedėjo (greičiau atstovaujančio aukštojo mokslo institucijai, o ne meno aplinkai) turi būti apibrėžtas aiškiais taisyklėmis ir atskaitomybės sistemomis.

Akademijos vadovybę galima pagirti už pastaruoju metu aktyvų tarptautiškumo skatinimą. Sukurta tarptautinio koordinatoriaus pareigybė, organizuojami renginiai, įtraukiant tarptautinius ekspertus. Tačiau studentai apie juos žino nepakankamai ir priešinasi studijoms užsienyje pagal *Erasmus+* programą teigdami, kad yra sunku palikti studijas. Ekspertų grupė skatina akademiją ieškoti tinkamų tarptautinio institucinio bendradarbiavimo formų (bendrų projektų, keitimosi gerąja patirtimi ir t. t.).

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Tiesiogiai ir nedviprasmiškai išspręsti kriterijų, kuriuos turi atitikti baigiamasis darbas, aiškumo stokos problemą. Juos aiškiai ir skaidriai išdėstyti į studentą orientuotoje dokumentacijoje.
2. Nedviprasmiškai apibrėžti Studijų programos komiteto ir kurso vadovo ryšį, kalbant apie jų paskyrimą ir atskaitomybę, užtikrinant visiems studentams įgyjamos patirties lygybę.
3. Padidinti mokslinių tyrimų ir kritinę dalį baigiamuosiuose darbuose ir rimtai apsvarstyti, kokią įtaką tai turėtų bakalauro studijoms.
4. Apibrėžti ir sukurti aiškią mokslinių tyrimų aplinką ir kultūrą, kad magistrantūros studijų studentai kartu su kitais akademiniiais tyrėjais dalyvautų projektuose ir simpoziumuose.
5. Nustatyti aiškias ir ryškias ribas tarp darbo programoje ir praktikos, įskaitant atitinkamą atnaujintų LMTA patalpų naudojimą.
6. Ieškoti strategijos, kaip išnaudoti studentų energiją, ambicijas ir pasinaudoti jų verslumu tiek magistrantūros programos metu, tiek po baigimo.
7. Sukurti veiksmingą studentų vadybos įgūdžių ugdymo pagrindą, kad jie gebėtų kurti savo trupes.
8. Tęsti darbą, siekiant apibrėžti bakalauro ir magistrantūros studijų skirtumus studentams ir socialiniams dalininkams.
9. Įtvirtinti visus programos nuostatus ir vertinimo procedūras ir visuose dokumentuose išdėstyti aiškius kriterijus.
10. Teikti daugiau paramos ir informacijos apie studentų tarptautines galimybes (pvz., Erasmus+).
11. Išplėsti socialinių dalininkų bendruomenę ir apsvarstyti, kaip plačiau panaudoti išorės vertintojus visose programos veiklos srityse.
12. Apsvarstyti galimybes teikti didesnę finansinę paramą magistrantūros studentų darbams.

<...>

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)