



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *DRAMOS REŽISŪRA*
(621W41003)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *DRAMA DIRECTING (621W41003)*
STUDY PROGRAMME
at **KLAIPEDA UNIVERSITY**

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader:

Dr. Loïc Lominé

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. Dr. Jan Lindvik

Prof. Hjálmar Helgi Ragnarsson

Prof. Dr. Rūta Mažeikienė

Milda Paklonskaite (Student representative)

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Dramos režisūra</i>
Valstybinis kodas	<i>621W41003</i>
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis (pagrindinė)	Teatras ir kinas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Antra
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (1,5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	90 kreditų
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Teatro magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1997-05-19 Įsakymo Nr. 565

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Drama Directing
State code	<i>621W41003</i>
Study area	Arts
Study field (major)	Theatre and Film
Kind of the study programme	University
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1,5)
Volume of the study programme in credits	90 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master's degree in Theatre
Date of registration of the study programme	1997-05-19 Order No 565

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

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2. Curriculum design	6
3. Staff	8
4. Facilities and learning resources	9
5. Study process and student assessment.....	10
6. Programme management	12
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	14
IV. SUMMARY	15
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	16

I. INTRODUCTION

The **MA Drama Directing** study programme is offered by the Directing Department in the Faculty of Arts, at Klaipėda University. Klaipėda University Faculty of Arts is one of the 7 Faculties of Klaipėda University and it consists of 7 Departments, preparing specialists of theatre, music, dance and visual art. Established in 1975 the Directing Department seeks to prepare qualified theatre directors and actors, both at BA and MA levels. In 2011 the self-evaluation of *Directing* study programme was performed at Klaipėda University and, after the external evaluation performed by SKVC, the **MA Drama Directing** study programme was accredited for three years.

On Monday and Tuesday 5th-6th May 2014 – following the analysis of the programme's Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and the preparation of Preliminary Remarks – the Evaluation Team (ET) visited the Directing Department in the Faculty of Arts at Klaipėda University. The visit to Klaipėda University and Directing Department involved meetings with the following groups: senior administrative staff; staff responsible for preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report; teaching staff, students; alumni (graduates); social partners. The ET also had the opportunity to visit the Directing Department's facilities and learning resources, and to familiarize with course and final papers (MA thesis) and examination material. All the people involved in the accreditation process were open, positive and cooperative; the ET was fully supported by a competent translator. The ET would like to thank everyone involved in organizing the event and participating in the meetings.

The evaluation process followed the external evaluation procedures, set by the Ministry of Education and Science (by order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010) and the methodology for the evaluation of Lithuanian higher education institutions, set by the director of The Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (by order 24 July 2009 No ISAK-1652, amendments 05.11.2009; 17.12.2009; 30.09.2010). After the visit to Klaipėda University the expert group held the meeting in which the contents of the evaluation report were discussed to represent the opinion of the whole group.

Note: The ET's visit to Klaipėda University included evaluation of the **MA Drama Directing** at the same time as the **BA Directing**. The SER produced for each individual programme was based upon a common template document and, therefore, contained a significant amount of commonality. Except for students (two distinct meetings), all the ET's meetings (e.g. with social partners or teaching staff) were for both programmes at the same time. Consequently, the reports for **BA Directing** and for **MA Drama Directing** are similar in many ways, although respective differences have been made very clear; *likewise, this document stresses when recommendations applies to both BA and MA.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

1.1 The programme aims and learning outcomes are publicly accessible through the AIKOS system (www.aikos.smm.lt) and on the website of Klaipėda University (www.ku.lt). The aims and learning outcomes are precisely formulated (see SER § 10: “*To develop a skilled director–expert of drama (theatre, puppet shows, events) who is able to initiate the emergence of new professional knowledge, to innovate in the practical theatrical activities and to influence theatrical environment changes with his/her artistic outcome*”.) The triple reference to theatre, puppets and events is a direct echo of the objectives of the undergraduate course BA Directing, even though it is recognised that the emphasis of the MA is more on the director-expert. After discussion with staff and MA students, the ET however is not convinced that all MA graduates would be able to work professionally in the three areas equally (theatre directing, puppet directing, cultural events organising), as it seems that MA students focus on one of those three; in practice, this rational approach is understandable, however it is not what the MA programme seems to offer. Postgraduate studies being about specialisation, the programme aims and learning outcomes should be more specialised, rather than covering too much. The programme aims and learning outcomes are very ambitious; as they are written, they give the (misleading) impression that MA graduates would be able to work professionally in all three areas (theatre directing, puppet directing, cultural events organising). **The ET recommends** reviewing the aims and learning outcomes of the programme, stressing how the MA offers specialisation in one specific area such as puppetry or cultural event or drama directing.

1.2 The aims and learning outcomes are based on the academic and/or professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market. As it is noted in SER (pages 6 – 7) and as the ET realized during the meetings with staff and social partners, in the period of 2011 - 2013 the Directing Department of KU developed close contacts with social partners and principal employers of the programme graduates, discussed the aims and learning outcomes of the programme, the recommendations provided by the external evaluators in 2011; the ET found it very useful to read systematic responses, at the start of the SER, to all previous recommendations, one by one (see SER pages 7 to 10). The ET also heard evidence of the possible places for the employment of the graduates, and realised that there is a real need/demand to prepare a multidisciplinary directors for the labour market in Western Lithuania (in areas such as puppet and drama theatre directors, event directors and professionally prepared specialists for working in cultural centres). The programme’s aims, learning outcomes were redefined according to the recommendations of social partners and they are clearly based on the public needs and needs of the labour market; this is true for both BA Directing and MA Drama Directing.

1.3 The programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of MA studies. The SER (§ 16-17) states that the programme is located at Masters level, corresponding to the second-cycle studies of the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area and level 7 in the Lithuanian Qualifications Framework according to the descriptors of the Lithuanian Qualifications Framework, as well as to the seventh level in the European Qualifications Framework. The ET initially struggled to appreciate the difference between BA and MA, even though the SER on page 7 states that “The distinction between the Bachelor’s and Master’s studies is obvious enough” (with a summary that “*The purpose of the Bachelor’s programme is to educate a director who is able to create drama or puppet plays and events and has acquired theatre art knowledge and general cultural competence*” vs “*The aim of the Master’s programme is to prepare a director–expert of drama (theatre, puppet theatre or*

events), who is able to create a performance and to implement new things in practical theatre activity as well as to influence the changes in the theatre environment” (see pages 7-8 of SER). Discussion with teaching staff however clarified two important aspects: firstly, MA work is more individualised; secondly, BA is seen as “getting knowledge”, being more “outcome-oriented”, as opposed to the MA which is about “implementing knowledge”, being more “process-oriented” with a focused on research and knowledge generation. These useful clarifications satisfied the ET that the MA does not just represent an extension of the BA over three semesters, with a mere continuity, but that there is a real change of pedagogical approach and academic ambition.

1.4 The name of the MA programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other. The 2011 Review had formulated two recommendations about this point; the programme team discussed them and then discarded them (see SER page 7) with arguments that the ET finds convincing (e.g. about the change of name to “*Directing of Amateur Theatre*”) although some points are less clear (e.g. about not including more explicit elements of event directing in the programme).

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The programme aims and learning outcomes are coherent and regularly revised in response to the comments of the students, teachers, graduates and social partners; they are also clearly understandable to the students and teachers of the programme.
- As the Directing Department has close cooperation with social partners and employers, the programme aims and learning outcomes correspond to the needs of the local and regional labour market.

Weaknesses:

- The programme aims and learning outcomes are very ambitious; as they are written, they give the (misleading) impression that MA graduates would be able to work professionally in all three areas (theatre directing, puppet directing, cultural events organising).
- The pedagogical and academic differences between BA and MA are not entirely clear in the written documentation.

2. Curriculum design

2.1 The curriculum design meets legal requirements, as detailed on pages 16-17 of the SER. The programme has 90 ECTS credits that students complete over 3 semesters; the final semester (i.e. the second year of study) focuses on the students’ final dissertation. The curriculum design is clear and logical, following established practice for comparable courses at this level in Lithuania and abroad.

2.2 Study subjects and/or modules are spread evenly, their themes are not repetitive. The ET was initially concerned that students who had completed BA Directing at KU would be studying modules with similar topics (and taught by the same staff), for example the module “Directing 1”, however the students that the ET met explained that they were coming from a different pathway (through a bridging programme) and consequently did not see any repetition. The ET nonetheless encourages the programme team to remain vigilant for future cohorts, especially if MA students progress internally from the BA Directing at KU.

2.3 The content of the subjects and/or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies, at postgraduate level. A separate document with module descriptors was provided to accompany the SER. The ET noted that some modules seemed rather introductory and exploratory (for example about “History of Directing” with learning outcomes such as “to know and acquire the fundamentals of the classification of directing schools and comparative analysis” see page 19); the teaching team however explained that the modules have to be pitched at the right level, depending on the students’ background. This fits with the individualised approach that the programme team promises to deliver, however **the ET recommends** to be vigilant that all MA modules remain located at postgraduate level in both their learning outcomes and assessment, even if the subject matter is new to some of the students.

2.4 The content and methods of the subjects/modules are just appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes; this is congruent with the fact that the learning outcomes are very broad. The ET was surprised to see that there is no distinct module about aspects such as the organisation and management of cultural events, or puppetry design, for example, as the MA also aims to prepare students to work in those areas. The programme team’s response about the focus on directing was similar when a similar issue was raised about the BA Directing; for MA Drama Directing, rather than providing compulsory subjects such as “Theatre Music”, it would be more logical (more aligned with programme aims and learning outcomes) to have modules about the sectors that the MA explicitly aims to address (such as puppet shows and cultural events). As a consequence, **the ET recommends** the inclusion of subjects/modules directly linked to the sectors that the MA explicitly targets (such as puppet shows and cultural events).

2.5 The scope of the programme is broadly sufficient to ensure all the learning outcomes. The ET however noted that very few options (“occupation related elective subjects”) are available to students (such as “Chekhov’s Acting School” and “Baltic Culture and Mythology”). Seen the small number of students on the programme (i.e. 4-5 each year), it is also likely that some options may not be running some years. **The ET recommends** the inclusion of more options (which according to the SER page 22 is an aspect that the programme team wishes to work towards).

2.6 The content of the programme reflects some of latest achievements in science, art and technologies. The ET noted that recent changes have been introduced in this area in December 2012, as the scope for preparation of the final thesis (directing project) was increased, by giving 12 credits in the second semester and 25 credits in the third semester. This should help ensure that the students’ final assignment (major project at the end of the MA) is more thoroughly underpinned by research.

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The curriculum design reflects current practice in other similar courses elsewhere in Lithuania and abroad, so the MA students’ experience is comparable to their peers elsewhere, especially regarding the focus on independent/self-directed learning.
- The curriculum design makes it possible to welcome both alumni from KU BA Directing and from other backgrounds/pathways.

Weaknesses:

- Students would benefit from formal input in the specific areas of puppetry and events organisation

- There is some uncertainty whether the content of the MA programme is appropriate for achievement of the very ambitious aims and learning outcomes of the MA programme.
- Students would benefit from more optional modules, as the current choice is very limited.

3. Staff

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

3.2 The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes. According to the CVs provided to accompany the SER, the teaching staff have appropriate qualifications. The ET noted the fact that the teaching team was very dynamic and motivated, as well as engaged in the Review process. The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure that the learning outcomes are reached.

3.3 The number of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure learning outcomes. According to the SER § 56, in total 12 teachers participate in the implementation of the MA Drama Directing programme in the 2013–2014 academic year; seen the small cohort of students (between 3 and 5 each year) this number is sufficient for the adequate provision of the programme.

3.4 Teaching staff turnover can ensure an adequate provision of the programme. As it is stated in SER § 58 “the turnover of teachers of the Directing Department is not high, but consistent and focused on the involvement of young teachers”. Since 2011 the staff of the Directing Department was strongly rejuvenated; 7 young teachers, active and promising theatre practitioners, have been employed. The ET however noted that students rarely benefit from the input of visiting teachers or artists (from abroad or from other Lithuanian universities), even for short projects; **the ET recommends** the inclusion of visiting teachers (from other Lithuanian universities or from abroad) as this would be beneficial for the quality of studies, providing students with a wider range of ideas, approaches and perspectives. (The same recommendation was formulated for BA Directing; it applies to both courses, BA and MA.)

3.5 The higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme. KU provides the teaching staff with the possibility to improve their knowledge and professional qualification. KU encourages and supports teachers’ artistic and research activities. According to SER page 8, every year KU Artistic Activity Promotion Fund sponsors artistic projects initiated by teachers.

3.6 The teaching staff of the programme is involved in research (applied/artistic research) directly related to the study programme being reviewed. The teaching staff consists of specialists in drama theatre directing, puppet theatre directing, dance, scenography, acting, and other artistic areas important for the implementation of the programme. Most of the teachers participate actively in creative activities, some of them (for example, prof. G. Padegimas, prof. V. Masalskis, assoc. prof. R. Rastauskas, lect. L. Juodkaitė, lect. O. Lapina, lect. R. Valčik) are nationally recognized artists, who participate actively in international theatre processes (artistic tours in foreign countries, visits to international theatre festivals, forums, workshops, etc). The teachers’ artistic activities, both in Lithuania and abroad, is directly related to the study subjects and reinforces the content of the programme. **The ET recommends** that the international activities of teaching staff should be better communicated to students, as the meeting with students revealed that they are not aware of them. (The same recommendation was formulated for BA Directing; it applies to both courses, BA and MA.)

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The staff of the *Directing* study programme consists of dynamic and highly motivated teachers, who are active artists, open to contemporary theatre trends and to international mobility.
- 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.

Weaknesses:

- The students are not aware of the international activities and experiences of their teachers; they should be better communicated to the students.
- New artistic knowledge and experience of teaching staff could be included directly into the curriculum of individual teaching subject in order to share it with the students.
- The participation of visiting teachers (from other Lithuanian universities or from abroad) in the study process would be beneficial for the quality of studies at Directing Department.

4. Facilities and learning resources

4.1 The premises for studies are just adequate, both in size and quality. The ET was able to visit the premises to see how facilities are in the process of being improved and renovated, however there is still much scope for improvement, especially in terms of acoustics and organisation of space. The ET noted that the Faculty of Arts, having received LTL 1,347,000, has just finished refurbishing work using the EU structural funds for the project “*Updating infrastructure and basic equipment of KU humanities, social sciences and arts studies*”; this funding enabled, amongst other, renovation of classroom premises and acquisition of lighting and sound systems for several classrooms and halls; the programme team remains fully aware that more work is needed on the premises, yet “the funds to repair all premises [...] are insufficient” (SER page 31).

4.2 The teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are just adequate, both in size and quality. Although the SER states that “the stage of Educational Theatre is equipped with all necessary technical equipment and stage cloths” (§ 75), the ET is not convinced by the reference to “necessary” technical equipment. The ET believes that the Educational Theatre still requires further improvement to be of international standard – the ET however is fully aware of the budgetary constraints. Another example is the computer class: it has 10 working places; although computers have all the necessary software that *Directing* students should learn to use (i.e. Microsoft Office Package, Finale, Sibelius, Cubase, Wavelab, etc), the ET doubts that 10 working places is enough. It might depend how students’ IT learning is being supported (i.e. self-directed and independent learning vs tutorials/workshops). The ET did not see much evidence of students’ IT skills, despite the fact that today’s *Directing* students should be highly IT literate, not to mention the fact that it would help the students for their own academic work (information literacy skills, see SCR §81, incl. research in database and other electronic sources). As a consequence, **the ET recommends** that students’ IT skills and IT

literacy should be more clearly supported. (The same recommendation was formulated for BA Directing; it applies to both courses, BA and MA.)

4.3 The higher education institution has adequate arrangements for students' practice. The links with many social partners (such as local theatres) mean that students can complete projects in professional environments that are often of a better quality than the facilities and premises where they study. The SER (§ 82) mentions a range of precise examples, such as the cooperation agreements regarding *Theatre Pedagogic Practice* with many children theatres and youth theatres (such as "Aušra", "Trepšė", "Bendraamžiai" and many others). Students can perform their final thesis practice in Klaipėda, Šiauliai, Panevėžys drama theatres, Kaunas Small Theatre and Kelmė Small Theatre as well as Šilutė Municipality Theatre.

4.4 Teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are just adequate and accessible. The library offers a very limited selection of books and printed periodicals in English. According to the SER (§79, 80, 81), students are increasingly encouraged to make use of electronic resources, however students' IT literacy could be improved which is why the programme team listed as one of the weaknesses the fact that „the possibilities to access databases are insufficiently exploited“ (SER page 31).

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The premises of the Faculty of Arts are being renovated.
- The relationships with local theatres mean that students are able to both learn in practice in those venues and stage their final projects there.
- The Library is being improved (e.g. more books in English about puppetry).
- Students are encouraged to make more use of electronic resources.

Weaknesses:

- The funds to repair all premises and to further develop scientific, methodological and learning resources are insufficient – as a consequence, further necessary improvements cannot be done yet.
- The library offers a very limited selection of books and printed periodicals in English
- The possibilities to access databases and other electronic resources (such as e-books) are insufficiently exploited.

5. Study process and student assessment

5.1 The admission requirements are well-founded overall. As it is indicated in SER pages 31-32, procedures are different according to the student's status (e.g. students who have just graduated in the year of starting their MA do not have to take an entrance examination, whereas other students do, i.e. students who graduated in earlier years).

5.2 The organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. The ratio of contact and individual work hours is defined by KU Senate and seems to be measured and reasoned. Class timetables are made according to KU Study regulations, programme requirements and needs. Proportions of time

allocated for lectures, practicums, individual work is distributed in a measured manner, taking into the consideration the type of the study subject and the level of study.

5.3 Students are encouraged to participate in research, artistic and applied research activities. The Educational theatre of KU serves as a platform where students of *Directing* study programme can show their plays for audience. Students of different courses are encouraged to create their performances and to perform in Lithuania and abroad. Together with their teachers students create performances which are shown to different audiences in Lithuania and abroad, participate in international theatre festivals. Directing Department encourages students to participate in various students' festivals, contests and cultural community events.

5.4 Students have opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes, although the ET noted that few students seize these opportunities. The three MA students that the ET met explained that they had too many commitments, during the academic year, to go abroad to work on international projects. As for undergraduate students, language competency may also be an obstacle; the ET is aware that it may not be possible in the framework of the MA itself (unless the curriculum is revised and starts including compulsory elements of English), however the ET encourages the programme team to explore how would be possible to support MA students' further learning of English.

5.5 The higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support; the level of academic and social support at KU is efficient enough to respond to students' needs. The SER actually claims that "Academic support for students is provided in a consistent and efficient manner. This area has received the highest rate in the students' survey" (SER § 91) and students confirmed that academic support is provided in a consistent and efficient manner. It must also be noted that KU uses such ways of informing students about different academic matters as introductory week, meetings with Faculty's and Department's administration, websites of KU, Faculty of Arts, and Directing Department, board of Directing Department, KU Academic information system, e-mail communication, meetings of Group monitors, etc. Social support at KU is also provided in a regular manner: students can receive social grants and scholarships; financial assistance consists of loans, reduction of tuition fees, exemption of tuition fees; free psychological support is provided by KU Psychological Counselling Centre; KU Career Centre consults on career issues.

5.6 The assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available. Students' assessment is performed in various, suitable ways; the ET however expressed concern that in 2013, all 5 MA students got 10/10 for their final piece. As discussed with staff, it seems that marks awarded to students are so high that it is not possible to differentiate between the students, which partly negates the objective of an evaluation. **The ET recommends** a wider spread of marks, especially for the evaluation of the final MA thesis. (A similar recommendation was formulated for BA Directing; it applies to both courses, BA and MA.)

5.7 Professional activities of the majority of graduates meets the programme providers' expectations; not much data was provided to the ET about MA graduates' destinations, however the SER states that "In the period of 2009–2013 23 graduates completed the Drama Directing study programme. All of them are employed according to the specialisation." (§ 110). As for undergraduate students, it seems that postgraduate students then work in cultural and educational institutions (mostly in North-Western region of Lithuania), which confirms that there is a demand for the MA. The ET would have welcome more precise data about what MA graduates do upon completion of their course; as a consequence, **the ET recommends** that the MA

programme keeps track of its alumni more systematically, especially in terms of career destination and progression.

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The level of academic and social support at KU is efficient enough to respond to students' needs.
- MA graduates seem employed according to their specialisation, working in cultural and educational institutions, mostly in North-Western region of Lithuania.

Weaknesses:

- The exclusive use of maximum marks for Final Thesis, without any differentiation, may indicate some flaws in the evaluation system.
- The low participation of students in LLP/Erasmus mobility programme has to be improved; if this is due to poor command of the English language, some action/intervention should be implemented; this would also benefit students in the longer term, for their future career.

6. Programme management

6.1 Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated. The programme management and decision-making structure is clearly described in the SER (§ 112-115). The system is precise and rigorous, especially the way every month, the Head of the Directing Department and Head of the Drama Directing study programme meet with the representatives of students, presenting information about the course of studies, analysing proposals regarding organisation of studies or changes of programme, initiating and chairing the meetings of the Department and the Drama Directing Study Programme Committee (§ 114).

6.2 Information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed. The Directing Department regularly collects and analyses the information and the data on the implementation of the study programme, which is reviewed every year in regard to the analysis of the gathered information and data concerning the implementation of the programme (basically in regard to students', graduates' and employers' surveys).

6.3 The outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme. In 2011 the external evaluation of the MA programme was performed by SKVC (after the self-evaluation of the MA) and the programme was accredited for three years. The ET noted that all teaching staff were very aware of the recommendations made in 2011.

6.4 The evaluation and improvement processes involve stakeholders. Close relationships with social partners and employers (professional drama and puppet theatres (mostly from North-Western region of Lithuania), the Lithuanian Association of Culture Centres (LACC), the

Lithuanian Folk Culture Centre (LFCC), Lithuanian Union of Amateur Theatre (LUAT)) contributes to the evaluation and further development of the MA (and BA). On the one hand, the very close cooperation with social partners and employers is the strength of the implementation of the programme; on the other hand, there is a risk of becoming too dependent on external social partners.

6.5 The internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient. The outcomes of the internal evaluation of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme. The ET wants to stress and praise the fact that the learning outcomes are regularly (every year) revised in response to the recommendations of students (via student's surveys), teachers (via periodical teacher's meetings in Directing Department), graduates (via graduate's surveys and informal communication), social partners and employers (via survey's and regular meetings).

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the MA are clearly allocated.
- Strong interaction between programme's managers, teachers, students and social partners contributes to the improvement of the quality of the studies.
- The outcomes and recommendations of the 2011 external evaluation of the MA were used for the improvement and the successful implementation of the programme.

Weaknesses:

- The very close cooperation with social partners and employers can become a disadvantage as it is important to preserve the autonomy of the university. There is a risk of becoming too dependent on social partners and employers.
- As the Head of Directing Department and the Head of the Committee of *Directing* study programme are mainly responsible for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the *Directing* study programme, it could be useful to assign these positions to different persons.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Evaluation Team recommends reviewing the aims and learning outcomes of the programme, stressing how the MA offers specialisation in *one* specific area such as puppetry or cultural event or drama directing (*see sub-section 1.1*)
2. The Evaluation Team recommends to be vigilant that all MA modules remain located at postgraduate level in both their learning outcomes and assessment, even if the subject matter is new to some of the students (*see sub-section 2.3*)
3. The Evaluation Team recommends the inclusion of subjects/modules directly linked to the sectors that the MA explicitly targets, such as puppet shows and cultural events (*see sub-section 2.4*)
4. The Evaluation Team recommends the inclusion of more options (*see sub-section 2.5*)
5. The Evaluation Team recommends the input of visiting teachers, from other Lithuanian universities or from abroad (*see sub-section 3.4*)
6. The Evaluation Team recommends that the international activities of teaching staff should be better communicated to students (*see sub-section 3.6*).
7. The Evaluation Team recommends that students' IT skills and IT literacy should be more clearly supported. (*see sub-section 4.2*).
8. The Evaluation Team recommends a wider spread of marks, especially for the evaluation of the final MA thesis (*see sub-section 5.6*).
9. The Evaluation Team recommends that the MA programme keeps track of its alumni more systematically, especially in terms of career destination and progression (*see sub-section 5.7*)

IV. SUMMARY

Positive aspects

1. The programme has very strong links with social partners and employers, locally and regionally.
2. Staff are very dynamic and committed, as well as open to contemporary trends and to international mobility projects.
3. The interactions between staff, students and social partners enable students to develop practical professional skills.
4. Students are highly employable.

Areas for improvement

1. The range of competencies (e.g. drama director, puppet director, cultural event organiser) within one single programme (“MA Drama Directing”) means that the programme may not be able to achieve all its ambitious intended aims and learning outcomes.
2. Although facilities are being renovated, there is still scope for improvement, especially regarding the organisation of space and acoustics.
3. Students’ IT skills and knowledge of foreign languages could be further supported; this would benefit them in the long term, beyond the studies at KU.

The recommendations are listed on the previous page.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme Drama Directing (state code – **621W41003**) at Klaipeda University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Staff	3
4.	Material resources	2
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	3
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	3
	Total:	15

*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:

Dr. Loïc Lominé

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. Dr. Jan Lindvik

Prof. Hjálmar Helgi Ragnarsson

Prof. Dr. Rūta Mažeikienė

Milda Paklonskaite (Student representative)