



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Šiaulių universiteto  
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *ESTRADOS MENAS***  
*(valstybinis kodas – 612W40001)*  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT**  
**OF *STAGE ART* (state code – 612W40001)**  
**STUDY PROGRAMME**  
at Šiauliai University

**Experts' team:**

1. **Prof. dr. Jan Lindvik (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Mr Mika Ritalahti,** *academic,*
3. **Dr. Hana Krejci,** *academic,*
4. **Doc. dr. Rūta Mažeikienė,** *academic,*
5. **Mr Gytis Valatka,** *students' representative.*

**Evaluation coordinator – Mrs Eimantė Bogdan**

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language – English

Vilnius  
2015

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Estrados menas</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612W40001
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis	Teatras ir kinas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Teatro ir kino bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2004-06-07 ISAK - 852

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Stage Art</i>
State code	612W40001
Study area	Art Studies
Study field	Theatre and film
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	first
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Theatre and Film
Date of registration of the study programme	07-06-2004 ISAK - 852

© 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>7</b>
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	7
2.2. Curriculum design.....	9
2.3. Teaching staff.....	12
2.4. Facilities and learning resources .....	14
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment .....	15
2.6. Programme management .....	18
<b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>IV. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>26</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. Along with the self-evaluation report and appendixes, 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 BA programme *Stage Art* (hereafter - SA programme) is the only programme in the field of Theatre and Film in Šiauliai University (hereafter - SU), but is not the only *acting* programme in

Lithuania. Actors are prepared at Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre (BA, MA *Acting*), Klaipėda University (BA *Acting*), Vytautas Magnus University (BA *Acting*).

The SA programme is implemented by the Department of Theatre in the Faculty of Arts at SU. Faculty of Arts is one of the 6 faculties of SU and it consists of 4 departments, preparing specialists of design, music, fine arts, and theatre. Established in 2006 the Department of Theatre seeks to prepare qualified university degree (BA) “theatre specialists” (Self-Evaluation Report, hereafter - SER, §10) and implements BA programme Stage Art. In 2011 the self-evaluation of SA programme was performed at SU and, after the external evaluation performed by SKVC, the SA programme was accredited for three years. After the accreditation in 2011 several changes were implemented in SA programme in order to improve it according the experts’ recommendations. The biggest change is that the specialization *Animation of Entertainment Culture* was created and introduced into SA programme.

On Monday 11 May 2015 – following the analysis of the SA programme’s Self-Evaluation Report (hereafter - SER) and the preparation of Preliminary Report – the Review Team (hereafter - RT) visited the Department of Theatre in the Faculty of Arts at SU. The visit to Department of Theatre at SU involved meetings with the following groups: senior administrative staff; staff responsible for preparation of the SER; teaching staff; students of all years of study; alumni (graduates); stakeholders (social partners). The RT also had the opportunity to visit the Department’s facilities and learning resources (classrooms, studios, Study Theatre, library, etc.), and to familiarize with students’ examination material, course and final papers (thesis) and diploma works. All the people involved in the accreditation process were open and cooperative; the RT was fully supported by a competent translator. The RT would like to thank everyone involved in organizing the event and participating in the meetings. After the visit, the RT discussed and agreed upon the content of the report, which represents the consensual view of the RT.

#### **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 *11 May 2015*

- 1. Prof. dr. Jan Lindvik (team leader)** *Professor at Norwegian Film School, Norway.*
- 2. Mr. Mika Ritalahti**, *former Head of the department at Aalto University, School of Art and Design, Department of Film and Scenography; producer / managing director at Silva Mysterium, Finland.*
- 3. Dr. Hana Krejci**, *Assistant Professor of Theatre management and stage technology and management department, Theatre Faculty at Janáček Academy of Music and Performing Arts in Brno, Czech Republic.*
- 4. Doc. dr. Rūta Mažeikienė**, *Associate professor of Theatre Studies Department, Vice-dean of the Faculty of Arts at Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania.*
- 5. Mr Gytis Valatka**, *doctoral student at Vilnius University study programme Historical Sociology, Lithuania.*

## II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

### 2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The aim of SA programme is ambitious and multiple: “to develop a high qualified, competent, motivated, creative, university degree theatre specialist, which actively participates in shaping positive attitudes toward cultural diversity; is able to creatively develop and successfully apply acquired knowledge, skills and abilities in theatre and theatre-related programmes; reflects upon socio-cultural changes in the surroundings, is able to adapt to local, national and international employment market” (SER, §10). It is not very well defined as it is not clear from SER 1) what is a “university degree theatre specialist” (during the site visit RT realized that the programme team refers to “wide spectrum specialist”, “performer”, while students, alumni, social partners – to “actor”); 2) in what way the “theatre specialist” is able to reflect “upon socio-cultural changes in the surroundings”; 3) whether the SA programme prepares students to adapt to “international employment market” (although it was stated in SER (p. 8.) that SA programme is “in line with European education programmes” and “provides good opportunities for its’ graduates to enter European market”, the comparison with similar European BA programmes was not done in SER; the RT was not presented with the information on the international employment of the graduates).

The intended learning outcomes of SA programme are very wide, quite complicated, and perhaps even hardly achievable. There are 12 study results (which are grouped into five categories according to the descriptions of Study levels), but almost each of them encompasses several learning outcomes; e.g. the first study result (A1) indicates that the graduate will be able to do rather different things: to “apply means of theatre expressions of various genres and styles”, “to assess the impact and effect of theatre (...)”, “to apply and relate these (?) means of expression (...)”, “to express individuality (...)”, “to coordinate creative work of different sorts” (A1, SER, table 2). Some of the intended learning outcomes seem to be quite distant to the qualification of an actor (e.g. will be able “to describe and analyze modern cultural issues while exploiting achievements and methods of both art and science” (A2, SER, table 2)).

Although SA programme aims and learning outcomes are publicly accessible, the definitions vary: e.g. in AIKOS system one can find 9 learning outcomes [http://www.aikos.smm.lt/en/Study/layouts/15/Asw.Aikos.RegisterSearch/ObjectFormResult.aspx?o=LO&f=MokGalEn&key=8948\\_2015&pt=of&ctx\\_sr=NGkQxEZ2UKW7pbzkvRJh%2bdg86Hc%3d](http://www.aikos.smm.lt/en/Study/layouts/15/Asw.Aikos.RegisterSearch/ObjectFormResult.aspx?o=LO&f=MokGalEn&key=8948_2015&pt=of&ctx_sr=NGkQxEZ2UKW7pbzkvRJh%2bdg86Hc%3d); on SU website 3 intended learning outcomes

[http://www.su.lt/bylos/tarptautiniai\\_ryšiai/Programos\\_EN\\_RU\\_2014-2015/EN/estrados%20menas\\_b\\_mf.pdf](http://www.su.lt/bylos/tarptautiniai_ryšiai/Programos_EN_RU_2014-2015/EN/estrados%20menas_b_mf.pdf)

As it is noted in SER (p. 7) the aims and learning outcomes of SA programme are annually revised and updated in response to monitoring results, proposals from students, lecturers, social partners. The RT finds such periodicity (annually) too frequent and suggests to revise and update the aims and learning outcomes of the programme every two or three years. Last time the aims and learning outcomes were redefined in 2013, in response to the proposals from students, lecturers, social partners and the recommendations of international external review team.

The aims and learning outcomes of SA programme are based on the public needs and the needs of the labour market. According to SER the need of such programme is based on 1) the demand for theatre professionals in the region of Šiauliai, North Lithuania and the state b) the demand for theatre specialists prepared for “recreational stage genre”, which, according to SER is “left for self-regulation” (p. 5). The RT realized during the meetings with staff, graduates and social partners that there is an actual need to prepare wide spectrum actors for the labour market (theatres, cultural centres) in North Lithuania. The need for theatre artists in the region of North Lithuania was identified clearly as graduates were employed in Šiauliai, Panevėžys, Kelmė theatres, cultural centres of the region, etc.

The programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of BA studies in study field of Arts, the group of Theatre and Film and the level of qualification of Bachelor’s degree in Theatre. The name of the programme – *Stage Art* – partly corresponds to the structure of learning outcomes, programmes content and the qualification of the Bachelor’s degree in Theatre and Film.

The name of the programme, learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered, are compatible with each other to a certain extent. The issue of the identity and the name of the programme was already addressed by the previous team of external evaluation in 2011: “The identity and core of the programme is unclear, not sufficiently reflected”, “the name of the programme is problematic, as it does not give a realistic picture for the applicants nor the students about the core of the programme” (SER, appendix 1). The programme team rejected the recommendation to redefine the name of the programme, because, according to SER, “during the ten years of operation this title has grown with the programme” (SER, appendix 1). Although the programme organizers and lecturers find the name of the programme clear and corresponding to



the curriculum, the site visit revealed that the name of the programme is not entirely clear for the students (the English version of the name seems to be too broad, while Lithuanian one - too vague). In 2014, in response to experts' recommendations, the specialization *Animation of Entertainment Culture* was introduced into SA programme in order to "better define study direction and to provide graduates more competencies and opportunities for employment in a multi-layered world of entertainment" (SER, appendix 1). According to the programme team, the name of the specialization - *Animation of Entertainment Culture* - indicates the specificity and reflects the identity of the programme. The RT does not agree with this statement and finds the name of the specialization distant to the core of the programme (acting) and the qualification offered by the programme (Bachelor in Theatre and Film).

### **Strengths:**

- The aspiration to educate actors for the region of North Lithuania and find the unique profile of the programme;
- The aims and learning outcomes are periodically reviewed, based on the public needs and the needs of the local and regional labour market.

### **Weaknesses:**

- The aim and learning outcomes are not clearly articulated. The aim of the SA programme is too ambitious; the learning outcomes are very wide, complicated, and perhaps even hardly achievable. Some of the intended learning outcomes seem to be quite distant to the qualification of an actor.
- The name of the programme seems to be problematic as the English version of it (*Stage Art*) is too broad, while Lithuanian (*Estrados menas*) is a bit unclear (e.g. for students). The name of the specialization (*Animation of Entertainment Culture*) does not reflect the core of the programme (acting) and the qualification offered (Bachelor in Theatre and Film).

## **2.2. Curriculum design**

The programme consists of 240 ECTS credits (60 ECTS credits per academic year; 30 ECTS credits per semester) and has four-year duration of full time studies. Regarding the general scope of subjects and credits the curriculum design provides a sufficient study volume and meets the legal requirements, although one aspect (about study practice) is ambiguous.

According to the legal requirements, "practice shall be considered one of the seven separate study subjects" and "the total scope of practices must be at least 15 credits". It is indicated in

SER that “Student creative practice (15 ECTS credits) duration is five semesters in total (from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup>). It is not a separate study subject, but an integral part of the subject *Stage artist study. Creative practice*” (SER, §22). It is not clear whether this creative practice can be treated as study practice as: 1) it is not clarified in SER how 15 ECTS credits are allocated for study practice as the total volume of the subjects *Stage artist study. Creative practice* is 50 ECTS credits (10 ECTS credits for 5 semesters). The volume of the study practice must be clearly defined in descriptions of study modules (subjects) and other documents (like the triple agreement of practical placement); 2) subjects *Stage artist study, Creative practice* are taught by programme teachers and are implemented in the university (not outside the university as it is required in the terms of study practice); 3) the triple agreements between University, Host institution and Student were not signed. As a consequence, the RT recommends that the programme team review the volume of practical placement taking place outside the University.

In general study subjects are spread evenly, their themes are not repetitive. The curriculum of the SA programme consists of the 3 subjects’ blocks and meets the legal requirements:

- 1) general university subjects (21 ECTS credits) are “focusing on arts” (SER, §17); therefore the curriculum does not offer broader university education, only 6 ECTS credits are allocated for foreign language;
- 2) study field subjects (189 ECTS credits) are focusing on developing different competencies of an actor: some subjects are being taught continuously and are of the biggest importance (*Stage artist study*, 8 semesters, 74 ECTS credits; *Movement plasticity*, 8 semesters, 24 ECTS credits; *Music study*, 7 semesters, 21 ECTS; *Stage speech*, 6 semesters, 18 ECTS credits); other subjects expand and/or deepen these competences (e.g. theoretical subjects on history of art, theatre, drama; subjects on creative industries and culture management). During the meetings with students and alumni, the RT realised that the sequence of some study field subjects could be revised, especially the position of the subject *Stage make-up*, which could be taught in the first years of studies. In general, the scope of the study field subjects is sufficient to achieve main competences of an actor;
- 3) subjects of deeper specialisation (30 ECTS credits) *Animation of Entertainment Culture* (term *Leisure Culture* was used in SER synonymously) are designed to develop specific competences related to the field of entertainment (competencies of organizing events, animation, clowning, etc.). However, the RT finds such subjects as *Theatre education* and / or *Theatre therapy* quite distant from the field of entertainment.

The RT appreciates the response of the programme team to the recommendation of the previous experts’ team to consider the possibility of the specialisation(s), however the concept of the

specialisation *Animation of Entertainment Culture* is questionable. In RT view the specialization of the programme could “better define study direction” (as it is stated in SER, appendix 1), reveal the core of the programme and deepen students’ knowledge in some particular field. However, the scope of the specialization *Animation of Entertainment Culture* is very wide. It includes such comparatively distant subjects as e.g. *Theatre therapy* and *Event organization*. It is also unclear what subjects students have to study if they do not choose a programme with the specialization. Although it is indicated in SER that “new entrants can choose a program without specialization or with it” (SER, §17), the curriculum without specialization is not presented in SER.

During the site visit the programme team told about the plans to introduce more specializations into the programme. The RT team welcomes this initiative and recommends preparing minor specializations in cooperation with students, alumni and social partners. During the meetings with students and alumni the RT team realized that the specialization in theatre education would be beneficial.

It is recommended (in legal acts) that the study programme provide an opportunity and define the procedure for a free choice of subjects in the same institution, but the curriculum of SA programme does not provide such an opportunity for programme students.

There is some uncertainty whether the curriculum of the programme is entirely appropriate for the achievement of the multiple aims and learning outcomes of the programme. Links between programme learning outcomes and subjects (appendix 7) in some cases are not convincing (e.g. LO A2, “to understand the shaping of theatre art and its key historic stages; its impact and meaning in culture history (...)” is hardly achievable without some subjects in history of theatre and drama, but only subjects *Philosophy of art*, *Stage artiste study*, *Stage speech*, *Movement plasticity* and *Music study* are indicated in regard to this LO. (It has to be mentioned that the titles of some subjects in this appendix differ from the titles used in the rest of SER).

In general, the content of the study subjects is consistent with the type and level of the studies and reflects some of the latest achievements in science, art and technologies. But there is a need for the programme to incorporate more widely the latest achievements in theatre art in the specific subjects, to include more contemporary material into the teaching themes of different subjects, in particular in the reading lists.

**Strengths:**

- The structure of the main core of the curriculum (*study direction subjects*) is logical, study direction subjects are spread evenly, and their themes are not repetitive.
- The latest changes of the programme, namely the expanding of the curriculum with the specialisation, are made in respond to experts' recommendations and the needs of local labour market.

**Weaknesses:**

- The implementation of study practice should be reviewed as it does not seem to fully meet the legal requirements.
- There is some uncertainty whether the content of the programme is appropriate for achievement of the ambitious aims and multiple learning outcomes of the programme.
- The curriculum does not provide the opportunity to study a free choice of subjects, very few credits are allocated for foreign language.
- The concept of the specialisation *Animation of Entertainment Culture* is questionable. It is also unclear what subjects students have to study if they do not choose a programme with the specialization.

**2.3. Teaching staff**

The study programme is provided by staff meeting the legal requirements in terms of number, qualifications and areas of expertise.

The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes. According to the *Descriptions of Lecturer's Activities* provided in the appendix 4 of the SER, the teaching staff has appropriate qualifications and experience in creative or scientific activities directly related to the SA programme. The teaching staff consists of specialists in acting, directing, dance, music, and other artistic areas important for the implementation of the programme. Most of the teachers participate in creative activities, some of them are nationally recognized artists (for example, prof. G. Padegimas, assistant A. Gluskinas), theatre pedagogues (J. Žibuda, M. Žibudienė), theatre researchers (assoc. prof. dr. N. Šatkauskienė). The biggest part of study subjects are taught by artists or researchers whose qualifications are closely linked with the teaching subject. Although, there are some doubts about the competent implementation of some new, very specific subjects of the specialisation (e.g. *Performance art, Theatre therapy*).

The number of the teaching staff is just adequate to ensure learning outcomes. According to the SER p.12, in 2013 / 2014 academic year SA programme' subjects were taught by 11 teachers. The teachers' team consists of 1 professor, 1 associate professor doctor, 2 associate professors artists, 5 lecturers and 2 assistants (It should be noted that in *The list of the programme academic staff*, presented in the appendix 3, the numbers of teaching staff differ: there are indicated 4 lecturers and 3 assistants). 3 teachers of the programme (27 %) work on a full-time basis.

The teaching staff turnover can ensure an adequate provision of the programme. According to SER (§ 30) after the last evaluation "the team of lecturers was insignificantly renewed": two new lecturers started to work, two older pedagogues left. The commendable fact is that, following the recommendations of the previous evaluation, programme team is trying to attract young lecturers: since the last evaluation the teaching staff was rejuvenated with two young teachers, namely A. Gluskinas and L. Jankauskaitė.

The higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme. SU encourages and supports teachers' artistic and research activities. As it is indicated in SER (p. 17), "lecturers are encouraged to take part in international mobility programmes, projects, study trips, national and international development events".

According to SER (§ 34, 36), the academic exchange "was rather active" during the analysed period: 5 lecturers of the SA programme visited 6 foreign universities; "20 lecturers from abroad gave lectures to the programme students". However, meetings with students and alumni revealed that 1) students are not aware of the international activities of teaching staff; 2) they rarely benefit from the input of visiting foreign lecturers. The RT notes that 1) the international experience of teaching staff could be directly included into curriculum of teaching subjects; 2) the inclusion of visiting lecturers would be very beneficial for the programme.

### **Strengths:**

- The qualification of the teaching staff meets the legal requirements and is adequate to ensure learning outcomes of different study subjects in particular and the study programme in general.
- The staff of the programme consists of experienced and motivated teachers: the majority of them are practising as artists and keep a close relationships with the students.

- The programme team is trying to attract young lecturers: since the last evaluation the teaching staff was rejuvenated with two young teachers.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- The inclusion of visiting (national / international) lecturers would be beneficial for the implementation of the SA programme.
- The number of full time teachers could be increased in order to strengthen the artistic and academic activities of the university.
- The international activities of teaching staff could be more encouraged and supported by the university.

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

The premises, teaching and learning equipment used for the study programme are just adequate, both in size and quality. The practical lectures are mostly given at the *Study Theatre* (Vytautas st. 103 a, Šiauliai). The same premises also house the Department of Theatre and cellar auditorium. Some lectures are given at the University building (VIII palace, P.Visinskis st. 11), which also belongs to the Faculty of Arts. The theoretical lectures are given at the same building or at the SU library. Although, it is stated in SER (§ 43) that the premises for studies are “satisfactory and suitable” and the “*Study theatre* is fully equipped with required equipment”, the RT believes that the infrastructure for studies requires substantial improvement to be on an international standard. This goes especially for the lighting equipment that looked out-dated and far from any standard. The main premises for practical lectures are un-renovated, poorly heated and badly ventilated. The number of rehearsal rooms is just satisfactory. The stage of *Study theatre* is rather spacious, but the backstage of the stage does not meet contemporary requirements. The steep stairs and the narrow space for back-stage activities indicate even a safety risk for students. On site, the RT also noted the lack of showers; the spaces for props and costumes, make-up rooms are rather modest.

Close links between Department of Theatre and social partners (such as local or regional theatres, cultural houses, schools) mean that students can practice in professional environments. But the implementation of students’ practice should be organized in a more formal and consistent way. Meeting with students and graduates revealed that the study practice is not clearly organized. Sometimes it is very difficult for a student to find a proper place for his / her study practice, or even to practice outside university at all. The programme team believes that the

*Study theatre* is an appropriate place for study practice, but students would like to practice outside university, in “real” theatrical environments. The RT agrees with students and does not find the implementation of the study practice in *Study theatre* appropriate.

Teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible for programme students. SU library is fully renovated to a very high specification and at most cases fulfils the needs of the programme. However the literature resources could be expanded with more specialized literature.

### **Strengths**

- SU has the *Study Theatre*, which is the main place for the implementation of the programme.
- SU library is fully renovated to a very high specification and at most cases fulfils the needs of the programme.

### **Weaknesses**

- The premises, teaching and learning equipment used for the study programme are just adequate, both in size and quality.
- The infrastructure for studies requires substantial improvement to be on an international standard.
- The implementation of students’ practice should be organized in a more formal and consistent way in order to fulfil students’ needs to practice outside university.

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

The admission requirements are well-founded overall. As it is indicated in SER (p. 22), the admission requirements and the competitive score for SA programme are determined by Lithuanian Association of Higher Education Institutions for Joint Admission (LAMA BPO). The admissions to all study programmes in Lithuania are organized by the same institution. The competitive score consists of several factors: entrance examination (0,7), grade for the examination in the Lithuanian language (0,2) and annual grade of foreign language (0,1). As it is indicated in SER (p. 22), “The program has specific entry requirements, which are verified during the entry examination. The applicant presents an individual program, responds to questions about his motivation to study and a chosen specialisation, ability to express her thoughts and about a cultural life of an applicant. Entry examination of the program is *acting and*

*music*” (p. 12). Such specific entry requirements “attempts to evaluate inborn abilities, suitability for a profession and motivation of an applicant”.

Student entry process takes place annually, but the number of applicants and number of accepted entrants radically decreases. Although, only 5 students were admitted in 2014, the ratio of applicants and accepted students seems to be too high.

In general, the organisation of the study process is good and ensures an adequate provision of the programme. However, some issues of the organisation of the study process seems to be problematic: 1) the systematic organisation of study practice in professional institutions has not been implemented yet. Students commented that they would greatly benefit from the compulsory study practice outside the SU. The RT strongly suggests to develop and implement a systematic organization of study practice in professional institutions; 2) it is stated in SER (§ 75) that students have an opportunity to select subjects based on their needs (*free electives*), but the programme does not provide the possibility to choose free elective subjects as a part of the SA programme curriculum.

Students are encouraged to participate in artistic activities during the whole period of their studies. As SER shows, students are taking part in professional artistic projects in Šiauliai, Panevėžys, Kelmė and other theatres (§ 68), are organizing and participating in students’ theatre festival (§ 69), taking part in some artistic contests (§ 69), participating artistically in SU events (§70), etc.

The level of academic and social support at SU is good. According to SER, students are provided with various forms of social, academic and cultural support (scholarships, discount system, dormitory, children-care centre, medical support room, educational trips, etc.). Students confirmed that the level of support is sufficient enough to respond to their needs. Although it is not clear whether students really use these possibilities, e.g. it is indicated in SER (§ 78) that “student career counselling opportunities are extensively provided by the University career centre”, but students seemed not to be aware of the activities of the SU *Career Centre*.

The assessment system of students’ performance is clear and adequate. Students’ assessment is performed in various ways: midterm examinations, individual work, teamwork, defence of final creative project, etc. According to SER (p. 25), “students are introduced to the evaluation process and criteria in the beginning of a course, which ensures transparency and publicity of the



evaluation system". Students are evaluated on the basis of a ten-point scoring system and accumulative assessment. According to SER, the assessment system is well-grounded and objective. Students also expressed the satisfaction with the existing forms and rules of assessment.

Students have very limited opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes as SU has no LLP/Erasmus cooperation agreements with foreign universities in the field of Theatre Studies (SER § 66). Despite that fact SA programme students are participating in LLP/Erasmus exchange programme, mostly via SU cooperation agreements in the field of Educology. As the table 13 shows (SER, P. 26), the number of outgoing students grows, but the quality of their exchange studies (in terms of professional development) is very doubtful. Students' mobility under LLP/Erasmus internship programme is also questionable as the places of students' internships are not connected with cultural field (as it is indicated SER table 13, 2 of 3 places of internships are hotels). Due to the lack of cooperation agreements in the field of Theatre Studies, the programme has no incoming students. However, some foreign students (from other SU study programmes) are studying separate subjects of the programme (mostly *Clowning*). The RT strongly recommends developing the international cooperation and formal partnerships (via LLP / Erasmus or bilateral agreements) in the field of Theatre Studies in order to guarantee the adequate level of exchange studies and internships.

Professional activities of the majority of graduates meet the programme providers' expectations: over half of the graduates work in the field of theatre and TV, participate in creative projects, organize events and leisure activities, etc. Some graduates are continuing studies at Master's level, some of them are working in areas, which are not connected to their studies. Successful graduates' work in the field of creative and cultural industries (mostly in North Lithuania) proves the demand of SA programme at SU.

**Strengths:**

- The level of academic and social support at SU is efficient enough to respond to students' needs.
- The biggest part of programmes' graduates is employed according to their specialisation. Successful graduates' work in the field of creative and cultural industries (mostly in North Lithuania) proves the demand of SA programme at SU.

### **Weaknesses:**

- The number of applicants and number of accepted entrants radically decreases. The ratio of applicants and accepted students seems to be too high.
- Students have very limited opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes as SU has no LLP/Erasmus cooperation agreements with foreign universities in the field of Theatre Studies.
- The systematic organisation of study practice in professional institutions has not been implemented yet.

### **2.6. Programme management**

SU has internal study quality assurance system, which has to ensure the study quality of SA programme.

The structure of SA programme's administration and the participants of the process of study quality assurance are indicated in the table 17, p. 31. The table shows that on the Faculty level the administration and quality assurance are performed by: a) Faculty of Arts (Council, Dean's office, Study programme evaluation committee); b) Chair of the study programme committee (SPC); c) Study programme committee (SPC); d) Study subject author; e) Study subject lecturer (table 17, p. 31). It is not clear from this table, why the Department of Theatre is excluded from this structure and why the functions of the study subject author and study subject lecturer are strictly separate (and how this works in the reality).

SA programme has the study programme committee (hereinafter – SPC), which is responsible for: 1) achievement of programme aims; 2) continuous quality assurance; 3) monitoring; 4) improvement of the programme (SER §83). SPC consists of 7 members, whose responsibilities, according to SER, are allocated according to their area of expertise (although these responsibilities are not clearly described in SER). The chair of SPC is responsible for implementing rector's orders, dean's regulations and department's decisions (SER §83). It is not clear whether the meetings of SPC are regular.

The Faculty of Arts collects and analyses the information and the data on the implementation of the SA programme (SER § p. 32). Every two years the students' survey is carried out. Information from stakeholders is also collected, mostly in a non-formal way. Feedback from teachers is collected via different forms of communication (from department meetings to round

table discussions). It is stated in SER that SA programme is reviewed regularly in regard to the analysis of the gathered information and data concerning the implementation of the programme.

The outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used for the development of the programme. In 2011 the external evaluation of the SA programme was performed by SKVC (after the self-evaluation of the SA programme) and the programme was accredited for three years. Some of the outcomes of the last external evaluation have been used for the improvement of the programme (for example, introducing of the specialisation), but also some of the recommendations were discarded (for example, recommendations about the programme's name and aims).

The RT was confirmed that the Department of Theatre has close relationships with social partners and employers. It is stated in SER that “there are plenty of meeting opportunities with the stakeholders” (SER § 90) and that stakeholders “do impact a general programme plan”, but it would be also useful to develop the relationship with partners in a more formal way (e.g. cooperation agreements could be signed; the feedback from the stakeholders could be collected in a more formal way).

The internal quality assurance measures are effective, but there is still scope for improvement, especially regarding clarification and formalisation of some procedures.

**Strengths:**

- SU has internal study quality assurance system, which has to ensure the study quality of SA programme.
- Information and data on the implementation of the programme are collected and analysed.
- The Department of Theatre has close relationships with social partners and employers.

**Weaknesses:**

- The responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the SA programme are allocated, but they could be articulated more clearly.
- A formal way to collect feedback from graduates and stakeholders is not completely established.
- The outcomes of the last external evaluation have been used for the improvement of the programme only to some extent.

- As Head of Department of Theatre and Head of the study programme committee (SPC) are mainly responsible for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of SA programme, it could be useful to assign these positions to different persons.

### **III. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. It is recommended to rethink and redefine the title of the programme as well as its aims, learning outcomes and specialization(s) in regard to the concrete needs of the programme's students, graduates, local market and the qualification offered.
2. It is recommended to review the curriculum in regard to these aspects: volume of study practice taking place outside university; sequence of some study field subjects; subjects of specialization(s); free choice subjects; number of credits allocated for foreign language.
3. It is recommended to develop and implement a systematic organization of study practice in professional institutions.
4. It is recommended to involve into the implementation of the programme visiting (national / international) lecturers.
5. It is recommended to develop the international cooperation and formal partnerships (via LLP / Erasmus or bilateral agreements) in the field of Theatre Studies in order to guarantee the adequate level of exchange studies, internships and teaching mobility.
6. It is recommended to establish and ensure a formal way to collect feedback from graduates and stakeholders.
7. It is recommended to improve the infrastructure for studies (premises, teaching and learning equipment).

## IV. SUMMARY

### 1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

#### Strengths:

- The aspiration to educate actors for the region of North Lithuania and find the unique profile of the programme;
- The aims and learning outcomes are periodically reviewed, based on the public needs and the needs of the local and regional labour market;

#### Weaknesses

- The aim and learning outcomes are not clearly articulated. The aim of the SA programme is too ambitious; the learning outcomes are very wide, complicated, and perhaps even hardly achievable. Some of the intended learning outcomes seem to be quite distant to the qualification of an actor.
- The name of the programme seems to be problematic as the English version of it (*Stage Art*) is too broad, while Lithuanian (*Estrados menas*) is a bit unclear (e.g. for students). The name of the specialisation (*Animation of Entertainment Culture*) does not reflect the core of the programme (acting) and the qualification offered (Bachelor in Theatre and Film).

### 2. Curriculum design

#### Strengths

- The structure of the main core of the curriculum (*study direction subjects*) is logical, study direction subjects are spread evenly, and their themes are not repetitive.
- The latest changes of the programme, namely the expanding of the curriculum with the specialisation, are made in respond to experts' recommendations and the needs of local labour market.

#### Weaknesses

- The implementation of study practice should be reviewed as it does not seem to fully meet the legal requirements.
- There is some uncertainty whether the content of the programme is appropriate for achievement of the ambitious aims and multiple learning outcomes of the programme.

- The curriculum does not provide the opportunity to study a free choice of subjects, very few credits are allocated for foreign language.
- The concept of the specialisation *Animation of Entertainment Culture* is questionable. It is also unclear what subjects students have to study if they do not choose a programme with the specialization.

### 3. **Teaching staff**

#### **Strengths**

- The qualification of the teaching staff meets the legal requirements and is adequate to ensure learning outcomes of different study subjects in particular and the study programme in general.
- The staff of the programme consists of experienced and motivated teachers: the majority of them are practising as artists and keep a close relationships with the students.
- The programme team is trying to attract young lecturers: since the last evaluation the teaching staff was rejuvenated with two young teachers.

#### **Weaknesses**

- The inclusion of visiting (national / international) lecturers would be beneficial for the implementation of the SA programme.
- The number of full time teachers could be increased in order to strengthen the artistic and academic activities of the university.
- The international activities of teaching staff could be more encouraged and supported by the university.

### 4. **Facilities and learning resources**

#### **Strengths**

- SU has the *Study Theatre*, which is the main place for the implementation of the programme.
- SU library is fully renovated to a very high specification and at most cases fulfils the needs of the programme.

#### **Weaknesses**

- The premises, teaching and learning equipment used for the study programme are just adequate, both in size and quality.

- The infrastructure for studies requires substantial improvement to be on the international standard.
- The implementation of students' practice should be organized in a more formal and consistent way in order to fulfil students' needs to practice outside university.

## 5. Study process and students' performance assessment

### Strengths

- The level of academic and social support at SU is efficient enough to respond to students' needs.
- The biggest part of programmes' graduates is employed according to their specialisation. Successful graduates' work in the field of creative and cultural industries (mostly in North Lithuania) proves the demand of SA programme at SU.

### Weaknesses

- The number of applicants and number of accepted entrants radically decreases. The ratio of applicants and accepted students seems to be too high.
- Students have very limited opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes as SU has no LLP/Erasmus cooperation agreements with foreign universities in the field of Theatre Studies.
- The systematic organisation of study practice in professional institutions has not been implemented yet.

## 6. Programme management

### Strengths

- SU has internal study quality assurance system, which has to ensure the study quality of SA programme.
- Information and data on the implementation of the programme are collected and analysed.
- The Department of Theatre has close relationships with social partners and employers.



## **Weaknesses**

- The responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the SA programme are allocated, but they could be articulated more clearly.
- A formal way to collect feedback from graduates and stakeholders is not completely established.
- The outcomes of the last external evaluation have been used for the improvement of the programme only to some extent.
- As Head of Department of Theatre and Head of the study programme committee (SPC) are mainly responsible for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of SA programme, it could be useful to assign these positions to different persons.

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Stage Art* (state code – 612W40001) at Šiauliai University is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	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
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>13</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: Team leader:	Prof. dr. Jan Lindvik
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Mr Mika Ritalahti
	Dr. Hana Krejci
	Doc. dr. Rūta Mažeikienė
	Mr Gytis Valatka

**ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS  
ESTRADOS (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612W40001) 2015-08-10 EKSPERTINIO  
VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-236 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

**VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Šiaulių universiteto studijų programa *Estrados menas* (valstybinis kodas – 612W40001) vertinama **teigiamai**.

<b>Eil. Nr.</b>	<b>Vertinimo sritis</b>	<b>Srities įvertinimas, balais*</b>
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
	<b>Iš viso:</b>	<b>13</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)

<...>

**IV. SANTRAUKA**

**Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai**

**Stiprybės:**

- Siekis parengti aktorius Šiaurės Lietuvos regionui ir sukurti unikalų programos profilį.

- Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai nuolat tikslinami atsižvelgiant į visuomenės ir vietos bei regiono darbo rinkos poreikius.

### **Silpnybės**

- Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai nėra aiškiai suformuluoti. Studijų programos *Estrados menas* tikslas yra pernelyg pretenzingas, o numatomi studijų rezultatai – labai platūs ir gal netgi sunkiai pasiekiami. Panašu, kad kai kurie numatomi studijų rezultatai yra gana nutolę nuo aktoriaus kvalifikacijos.
- Programos pavadinimas, atrodo, yra problemiškas, nes jo angliškasis variantas yra per platus, o lietuviškasis (*Estrados menas*) – šiek tiek neaiškus (pvz., studentams). Specializacijos pavadinimas (*Pramogų kultūros animavimas*) neatspindi programos esmės (vaidybos) ir suteikiamos kvalifikacijos (teatro ir kino bakalauras).

### **Programos sandara**

#### **Stiprybės**

- Programos branduolio struktūra (*studijų krypties dalykai*) yra logiškai pagrįsta, studijų krypties dalykai išdėstyti nuosekliai, jų temos nesikartoja.
- Naujausi programos pakeitimai, būtent programos papildymas specializacija, atlikti atsižvelgiant į ekspertų rekomendacijas ir vietos darbo rinkos poreikius.

#### **Silpnybės**

- Reikėtų persvarstyti studijų praktikos įgyvendinimo tvarką, nes panašu, kad ji ne visai atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus.
- Nelabai aišku, ar programos turinys yra tinkamas, kad būtų galima pasiekti pretenzingus programos tikslus ir daugialypius numatomus studijų rezultatus.
- Programos sandara (studijų turinys) neužtikrina galimybės studijuoti laisvai pasirenkamus dalykus, labai mažai kreditų skiriama užsienio kalbai.
- Specializacijos *Pramogų kultūros animavimas* sąvoka yra ginčytina. Be to, neaišku, kokius dalykus studentai turi mokytis, jei nepasirenka programos su specializacija.

### **Personalas**

### **Stiprybės**

- Dėstytojų kvalifikacija atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus ir yra pakankama, kad užtikrintų, jog bus pasiekti pirmiausia įvairių studijų dalykų, taip pat ir visos programos numatomi studijų rezultatai.
- Programos dėstytojai yra patyrę ir motyvuoti, daugelis jų – praktikuojantys aktoriai, palaikantys glaudžius ryšius su studentais.
- Programos įgyvendinimo grupė stengiasi pritraukti jaunų dėstytojų – po paskutiniojo vertinimo dėstytojų gretos pasipildė dviem jaunais dėstytojais.

### **Silpnybės**

- Studijų programos *Estrados menas* įgyvendinimo tikslu būtų naudinga kviestis šalies ir (arba) užsienio lektorius.
- Siekiant sustiprinti meninę ir akademinę veiklą universitete, būtų galima didinti visu etatu dirbančių dėstytojų skaičių.
- Universitetas turėtų labiau skatinti ir remti dėstytojų tarptautinę veiklą.

### **Materialieji ištekliai**

#### **Stiprybės**

- Šiaulių universitetas turi *Studijų teatrą* – tai pagrindinė šios programos įgyvendinimo vieta.
- Šiaulių universiteto biblioteka yra visiškai renovuota pagal labai aukštus standartus ir iš esmės atitinka šios programos poreikius.

#### **Silpnybės**

- Šiai studijų programai skirtos patalpos, studijoms naudojama įranga ir metodiniai išteklių apimtis ir kokybė yra vos pakankami.
- Studijų infrastruktūrą reikia smarkiai gerinti, kad ji atitiktų tarptautinį standartą.
- Studentų praktika turėtų būti organizuojama oficialiau ir nuosekliau siekiant patenkinti studentų poreikį atlikti praktiką už universiteto ribų.

### **Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas**

#### **Stiprybės**

- Akademinės ir socialinės paramos lygis Šiaulių universitete yra pakankamai veiksmingas, kad patenkintų studentų poreikius.
- Didžioji šios programos absolventų dalis įdarbinama pagal specialybę. Tai, kad universiteto absolventai sėkmingai dirba kūrybinių ir kultūrinių industrijų srityje (daugiausia Šiaurės Lietuvoje), rodo Šiaulių universitete įgyvendinamos studijų programos *Estrados menas* paklausą.

### **Silpnybės**

- Stojančiųjų ir priimtų studentų skaičius radikaliai mažėja. Stojančių ir priimamų studentų santykis, atrodo, yra pernelyg aukštas.
- Studentai turi labai mažai galimybių dalyvauti studentų judumo programose, kadangi Šiaulių universitetas nėra sudaręs LLP / *Erasmus* bendradarbiavimo sutarčių su užsienio universitetais teatro studijų srityje.
- Dar neįgyvendinta studijų praktikos profesinėse institucijose organizavimo sistema.

### **Programos vadyba**

#### **Stiprybės**

- Šiaulių universitetas yra parengęs vidinio studijų kokybės užtikrinimo sistemą, kuri turi garantuoti studijų programos *Estrados menas* studijų kokybę.
- Renkama ir nagrinėjama su programos įgyvendinimu susijusi informacija bei duomenys.
- Teatro katedra glaudžiai bendradarbiauja su socialiniais partneriais ir darbdaviais.

#### **Silpnybės**

- Atsakomybė už sprendimus ir studijų programos *Estrados menas* programos įgyvendinimo stebėseną yra paskirstyta, bet galėtų būti aiškiau suformuluota.
- Nėra galutinai nustatytas oficialus absolventų ir socialinių dalininkų grįžtamojo ryšio rinkimo būdas.
- Tobulinant programą tik iš dalies pasinaudota paskutiniojo išorinio vertinimo išvadomis.
- Kadangi Teatro katedros vadovas ir Studijų programos komiteto vadovas yra iš esmės atsakingi už sprendimus ir studijų programos *Estrados menas* įgyvendinimo stebėseną, būtų naudinga į šias pareigas skirti atskirus asmenis.

<...>

### III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Rekomenduojama persvarstyti ir iš naujo apibrėžti programos pavadinimą, taip pat ir jos tikslus, numatomus studijų rezultatus bei specializaciją (-as) atsižvelgiant į konkrečius šios programos studentų, absolventų, vietos rinkos poreikius ir suteikiamą kvalifikaciją.
2. Rekomenduojama persvarstyti šiuos studijų turinio aspektus: ne universitete atliekamos studijų praktikos apimtį, kai kurių studijų krypties dalykų seką, specializacijos (-ų) dalykus, laisvai pasirenkamus dalykus, užsienio kalbai skirtų kreditų skaičių.
3. Rekomenduojama parengti ir įgyvendinti studijų praktikos profesinėse institucijose organizavimo sistemą.
4. Rekomenduojama į programos įgyvendinimo procesą įtraukti atvykstančius (šalies ir (arba) užsienio) dėstytojus.
5. Rekomenduojama plėtoti tarptautinį bendradarbiavimą ir oficialias partnerystes (sudarant LLP / *Erasmus* arba dvišales sutartis) teatro studijų srityje siekiant užtikrinti tinkamą studijų ir stažuočių pagal mainų programas lygį bei mokymo mobilumo lygį.
6. Rekomenduojama nustatyti ir taikyti oficialų grįžtamojo ryšio rinkimo iš absolventų ir socialinių dalininkų būdą.
7. Rekomenduojama gerinti studijų infrastruktūrą (patalpas, mokymui ir mokymuisi skirtą įrangą).

<...>

---

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)