



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *REŽISŪRA* (612W41005)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *DIRECTING* (612W41005)
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>Režisūra</i>
Valstybinis kodas	<i>612W41005</i>
Studijų sritis	Menai
Studijų kryptis (pagrindinė)	Teatras ir kinas
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Pirma
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240 kreditų
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Teatro bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1997-05-19 Įsakymo Nr. 565

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Directing
State code	<i>612W41005</i>
Study area	Arts
Study field (major)	Theatre and Film
Kind of the study programme	University
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	240 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor'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	7
3. Staff	9
4. Facilities and learning resources	10
5. Study process and student assessment.....	12
6. Programme management	14
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	16
IV. SUMMARY	17
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	18

I. INTRODUCTION

The BA *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 BA *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 (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 **BA Directing** as well as the **MA Drama 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.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. *Programme aims and learning outcomes*

1.1 The programme aims and learning outcomes are publicly accessible on KU website (https://web.liemis.lt/kuis/stp_report_ects.card_ml?p_valkod=612W41005&p_year=2014&p_lang=LT). The BA *Directing* study programme is designed to prepare a professional director, “a qualified specialist capable of creating professional theatre performances, puppet theatre plays, organize and conduct events, and work with theatre amateurs” (SER § 12). The aims and learning outcomes are oriented towards the development of the professional skills fundamental for future directors. The list of the learning outcomes informs that the programme will develop different common/universal and professional/specialized competencies (integrated knowledge of professional activity of theatre directing, ability to conduct research, special skills, social abilities and personal abilities; list of learning outcomes of study programme, SER, page 10 – 12) and will prepare a qualified theatre professional capable to work as a “professional drama theatre director, a puppet theatre director, an event organizer, director and manager, and a director of children, youth and adult amateur theatres” (SER § 13). The high number of competencies, especially this plurality (“drama director.... puppet director... event organizer...”) is one key aspect that the ET struggled with, finding it confusing and hardly realizable within one and the same programme. The documentation refers to it several times (e.g. about the fact that students “gain additional competences in acting, puppet theatre or event directing”, SER §25); the programme team robustly defended this triple feature; these aims and the underpinning learning outcomes are clearly written and coherent, however **the ET strongly recommends** reviewing the broad spectrum of specialisations and competencies (i.e. drama director, puppet director, cultural event organiser) under one single umbrella term (see sub-section 1.1).

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 (page 9 – 10) 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 (especially the recommendation to “underline its unique profile” and to focus on the preparation of “a specialist of amateur theatre and event directing”). The ET heard evidence of the possible places for the employment of the graduates, and realised that there is an actual need to prepare a multidisciplinary theatre professionals 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.

1.3 The programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of BA studies in study field of Arts (not in Humanities as indicated in the SER), the group of Theatre and Cinema and the level of qualification of Bachelor’s degree in Theatre. The name of the programme – *Directing* – partly corresponds to the structure of learning outcomes, programmes content and the qualification of the Bachelor’s degree in Theatre.

1.4 The name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other to a certain extent. The issue of the name of the programme is addressed by the ET's recommendation 1. It was also the first recommendation of the 2011 review: "It should be considered to change the name of the programme from *Directing* to a more suitable designation for a programme training specialists for cultural centres and directors for cultural events". Even though the programme aims and learning outcomes respond to the concrete needs of different local and regional partners, the ET believes that ambitious multiple aim of the programme (to prepare directors for *professional* drama and puppet *theatres*, event directors for *cultural centres*, directors for children, youth and adult *amateur theatres*, directors with specialisation in *acting*) seems to be hardly achievable in the study process. This doubt is strengthened by the fact that during the period 2012 – 2014 the programme was implemented via two different specialisations - *Directing (Puppets)* and *Directing (Events)* – and the curriculums of these specialisations have noticeable differences (the curriculums of the specialisations were not presented in the SER, but they were given during the ET visit to KU and are also publicly accessible in the internet on the web site of KU: <http://www.ku.lt/studijos/studiju-programos/>).

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The programme aims and learning outcomes are well defined, 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 ambitious multiple aim of the programme seems to be hardly realizable in practice. The very fact that during the period 2012 – 2014 the programme was implemented via two different (in curriculum) specialisations - *Directing (Puppets)* and *Directing (Events)* – doesn't allow the ET to be convinced that different specialisations could be achievable under one programme.
- The programme offers the deeper specialisation in *Acting* (from the 5th semester), but the need of this specialisation is under discussion as it does not correspond to the main aim of the *Directing* study programme ("to prepare a professional theatre, puppet theatre or event director", SER § 10) and is not justified in regard to the programme *Acting* (612W41006) implemented by the same Directing Department.
- The very close cooperation with social partners and employers can be treated a disadvantage as the general shape of the programme become too dependent on their expectations, recommendations, and commissions.

2. Curriculum design

2.1 The curriculum design meets legal requirements, although one aspect (about volume of practical placement) is ambiguous. 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 it provides a sufficient study volume and meets legal requirements – however legal requirements also state that the volume of practical placement for the first level study programmes must be no less than 15 ECTS credits. The total volume of practical placement of the *Directing* study programme is 13 ECTS credits. It consists of the Practice of Theatre Pedagogy (6th semester; 3 ECTS credits) and Theatrical Practice (8th semester, 10 ECTS credits). It is indicated in SER that “after selecting the Directing as a study field subject, additional 15 credits are given for the practice in the fifth, sixth and seventh semesters” (SER § 33). This statement of the SER report is imprecise. The ET realised that in the curriculum of the programme there are such study subjects as Practice of Directing and Acting I (5th semester, 6 ECTS credits), Practice of Directing and Acting 2 (6th semester, 6 ECTS credits), Directing 7 / Practice (7th semester, 12 ECTS credits) or Acting 7 / Practice (7th semester, 12 ECTS credits), but these study subjects cannot be treated as practical placement, as they are taught by Directing Department teachers and are implemented in the university (not outside the university as it is required in the terms of practical placement). In the meetings with the ET, teachers and students confirmed that only two types of study practice (total volume of 13 ECTS credits) are performed as practical placement out of the university (Practice of Theatre Pedagogy and Theatrical Practice) and regulated by agreements with social partners. As a consequence, **the ET recommends** that the programme reviews the volume of practical placement taking place outside the University.

2.2 Study subjects and/or modules are spread evenly, their themes are not repetitive. The curriculum of the *Directing* study programme consists of the three subjects blocks: general university subjects (15 ECTS credits); study field subjects (170 ECTS credits); subjects defined by the University and chosen by the student, as well as subjects optionally chosen by the student (55 ECTS credits).

2.3 The content of the subjects and/or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies, at undergraduate level. The Units descriptors are understandable in terms of contents and scope, although some of the reading lists should be updated. (The content of different subjects could incorporate more integrally the latest world developments in theatre, especially in terms of using newest reading material for teaching and learning.)

2.4 The content and methods of the subjects/modules, however, are not entirely appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, seen how broad the learning outcomes are. The ET is not convinced that the structure and content of the study programme which was provided in the SER is appropriate for the achievement of the intended programme aims and learning outcomes as such versions of the study programme have not been implemented yet. It is indicated in the SER that the *Directing* study programme was amended with “Puppet Theatre Directing, Event directing or Acting alternatives” and approved as such in 2012. But as the ET realized from the descriptions of study programme presented on the website of KU (<http://www.ku.lt/studijos/studiju-programos/>) and from the meeting with Directing Department staff and students, since 2012 were implemented only different specialisations of this programme: *Directing (Puppets; 2012)* and *Directing (Events; 2013)*. The curriculums of these specialisations have many differences when compared with the structure and content of the

programme presented in SER. The curriculums of these specialisations were presented to the ET only during the visit to KU. The ET is not convinced that different specialisations could be achievable under the volume of one programme via alternatives and elective subjects. The very fact that since 2012 the Directing Department implements only different (in curriculum) specialisations of this programme and argues that the changes in curriculum were necessary in order to meet the needs of social partners (future employers) and to achieve required competences of Puppet Theatre or Event Director supports the doubt and uncertainty doubt that the content of the programme is not appropriate for achievement of the ambitious aims and learning outcomes.

2.5 The scope of the programme is not entirely sufficient to ensure all the learning outcomes. The curriculum of the programme is structured in such a way that after the two years of theatre studies students have the possibility to go into deeper specialisation in Directing or Acting (SER § 32) and to choose 2 alternatives 1) Event Directing 2) Puppet Theatre Directing (SER § 31). In the Table 5 (SER page 16) it is indicated that students have the possibility to choose 3 alternatives: Event Directing, Puppet Theatre Directing, Theatre Directing. The ET find the structure of the curriculum overcomplicated and are not sure that various specialisations (Directing, Acting, Event Directing, Puppet Theatre Directing) can be equally well developed and implemented in terms of the learning outcomes of the programme. The ET also doubts whether there is an actual need for the specialisation of *Acting* in the *Directing* study programme as the Directing Department implements BA study programme *Acting* which has quite a few same study field subjects (under the same study codes) as *Directing* study programme (e.g. Stage Language I, II, III, IV, Drama Theory, Drama History I, II, Creative Pedagogy, etc. https://web.liemis.lt/kuis/stp_report_ects.card_ml?p_valkod=612W41006&p_year=2014&p_lang=LT). Since according the legal regulations students can change a study programme of the same study field after every semester (in this case, from *Directing* to *Acting*), the ET encourages the programme team to reconsider the need to have specialisation in *Acting* in *Directing* study programme. The ET encourages to rethink the unique profile of the programme and to reconsider the possibility to implement different alternatives and/or specialisations in a more measured and reasoned way.

2.6 The content of the programme reflects some of latest achievements in science, art and technologies. The ET appreciates the response of the programme team to recommendation 3 of the previous review was well responded to (“It is recommended to include more subjects like *cultural identity* and *popular culture* and the latest achievements in international performance studies could be introduced”), however 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.

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The curriculum provides students with the opportunity to gain additional competencies of puppet theatre and event directing.
- The latest changes of the programme, namely the expanding of the curriculum with the alternatives of Puppet Theatre Directing and Event Directing, are made in close cooperation with social partners, future employers and respond the needs of local labour market.

Weaknesses:

- The total volume of practical placement of the programme should be reviewed as it does not seem to be sufficient to fully meet the new requirements (in terms of ETCS credits).
- The structure of the programme curriculum is overcomplicated and does not guarantee that various specialisations (Directing, Acting, Event Directing, Puppet Theatre Directing) can be equally well developed and implemented in terms of the learning outcomes of the programme.
- There is some uncertainty whether the content of the programme is appropriate for achievement of the ambitious aims and learning outcomes of the programme.

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 § 46, in total 19 teachers are employed in the Directing study programme, 13 of them (68 %) work on a full-time basis. The teachers' team consists of 2 professors, 7 associate professors, 6 lecturers and 4 assistants. The number of the teaching staff is sufficient for the adequate provision of the undergraduate study 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.

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 §55, KU Artistic Activity Promotion Fund sponsors significant artistic projects initiated by teachers, but this support could be bigger.

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 activity is directly related to the study subjects and reinforces the content of the programme. As it is indicated in SER §55 regular creation of plays and roles in drama theatres and films, participation in international artistic activities "improve professional experience, inspire the changes of the study programme and ensure the quality". **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. This could be done in the framework of the theatrical practice workshops that, according to SER (page 8) theatrical practice workshops are organized every day (Monday to Friday) from 8:20 to 10:00 a.m. at the initiative of teachers of the Directing Department since 2012. Although the SER states that during these workshops the teachers transfer new artistic experience to all the students of Directing Department, students themselves have not confirmed about these activities. These workshops could be formally included into the curriculum of individual teaching subject, in order to address directly students of the programme.

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 32).

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” (§ 65), 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 §71, 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.

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 (§72) 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).

4.4 Teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are just adequate and accessible. According to the SER (§69, 70, 71), 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 32); this corroborates Recommendation 5 (see sub-section 4.1)

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 learn in practice in those venues.
- 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 §77, the admission requirements and the competitive score for the *Directing* study 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 (which consists of three rounds and an interview on issues related to the study programme), grade for the examination in the Lithuanian language and annual grade of foreign language. The assessment commission of the entrance examination is set up of representatives of all the Lithuanian Higher education schools implementing programmes in Theatre and Cinema field. Different rounds of the entrance examination are organized in different places: the first round takes place in Vilnius (at LMTA), the second and the third rounds take place alternatively in other higher educational institutions. This centralized way of organizing admissions to the study programmes seems to diminish the role of the institution to select the most motivated and/or suitable candidates for the specific study programme as well as to give the opportunity to some talented students to get a state-funded study place

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 (SER § 34). 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 (SER § 94).

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. Although the Directing Department has 10 LLP/Erasmus cooperation agreements with foreign universities in the field of Theatre and Cinema (SER § 95) and KU applies different measures to promote students' mobility (SER § 96), the level of students' participation in LLP/Erasmus exchange programmes is very low (during the analysed period: only 2 cases) and has to be improved. According to programme teachers and students too, the main reason for low mobility via LLP/Erasmus or Bilateral agreements exchange is students' unwillingness to "suspend intensive studies" during study semester (SER § 95). The ET wants to note that one of the reasons for low students' mobility could be a lack of English language proficiency (which was obvious during the meeting with students). **The ET recommends** that students' knowledge of foreign languages (especially English) should be improved; this would make students more willing to participate in international exchanges; this could be through a revision of the programme curriculum (increase the amount of credits allocated to foreign language: only up to 6 ECTS credits are given for foreign language, what is quite low, comparatively to other study programmes of the same type); it would also benefit students in the longer term, for their future career.

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. Academic support is provided in a consistent and efficient manner (SER § 81), 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 carrier issues.

5.6 The assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available. Students' assessment is performed in various ways: midterm examinations, individual work, teamwork, defence of final creative project, etc. As indicated in SER (§ 87), students' "knowledge and skills are evaluated on the basis of a criteria-based ten-point scoring system and accumulative assessment". The ET agrees that "the structure of cumulative assessment score ensures a more comprehensive and objective evaluation of student achievement", but have doubts about the objective and differentiated evaluation of final projects and Final Thesis. Although the procedure of defending and assessment of Final Thesis is regulated by different KU's and Directing Department's documents (SER § 91), the use of very high marks for Final Thesis may indicate some problems in the evaluation process. **The ET recommends** a wider spread of marks, especially for the evaluation of final projects and Final Thesis.

5.7 Professional activities of the majority of graduates meets the programme providers' expectations; some graduates are continuing studies at Master's level, some work in fields which are not connected with their studies, but the biggest part of the graduates (76.1 % according to SER table 16) are employed according to their specialisation (SER § 98). Successful graduates' work in cultural and educational institutions (mostly in North-Western region of Lithuania) proves the demand of *Directing* study programme at KU.

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The level of academic and social support at KU is efficient enough to respond to students' needs.
- The biggest part of programmes' graduates is employed according to their specialisation. Successful graduates' work in cultural and educational institutions (mostly in North-Western region of Lithuania) proves the demand of *Directing* study programme at KU.

Weaknesses:

- The use of very high marks for Final Thesis, without any differentiation, may indicate some problems in the evaluation system.
- The low participation of students in LLP/Erasmus learning 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. According to KU statute (2012) the Directing study programme management is performed in 4 levels (SER § 101): 1) Senate and Rector's Council; 2) Council, Dean's Office and Dean of the Faculty of Arts; 3) Directing Department; 4) Committee of *Directing* study programme. The direct responsible for the content and implementation of the *Directing* study programme is the Committee of *Directing* study programme, which consists of 7 members, who have very clear functions in the Committee (SER § 104). The meetings of different executives for the implementation of the study programme are regular: Directing Department has meetings four times a year; Committee of *Directing* study programme have meetings twice a year. Every month the head of the Directing Department and Head of Committee of *Directing* study programme (the same person at the moment) meet with the representatives of students / mentors of the students' groups (SER § 103).

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 *Directing* study programme (SER § 105). *Directing* study programme 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 Directing study programme was performed by SKVC (after the self-evaluation of the *Directing* study programme) and the programme was accredited for three years. The ET noted that some of the outcomes of the last external evaluation have been used for the improvement of the programme's management (for example Recommendation 4 about clarifying assessment procedures and criteria for students) but also that some of the recommendations were discarded (for example Recommendations 1 and 2 about the programme's name, aims and curriculum).

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 *Directing* study programme. 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 (the case with different commissions for different specialisations of the *Directing* study programme from the social partners, when original version of the study curriculum had to be changed considerably).

6.5 The internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient. Every three years the self-evaluation of the *Directing* study programme is carried out by the Committee of *Directing* study programme (SER § 107). 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). Due to the close cooperation with students,

teachers, graduates, social partners and employers Directing Department not only updated the programme aims and learning outcomes, but also included alternatives (*Event directing; Puppet theatre directing; Directing and Acting Practice*) and new study subjects (*Cultural Project Management*) into the curriculum of the programme.

Main Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths:

- The responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the *Directing* study programme 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 / recommendations of the internal evaluations of the *Directing* study programme are 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 strongly recommends reviewing the broad spectrum of specialisations and competencies (i.e. drama director, puppet director, cultural event organiser) under one single umbrella term (*see sub-section 1.1*), as already recommended by the previous External Evaluation Team in 2011. This has implications for the aims and learning outcomes of the programme, as well as for curriculum design.
2. The Evaluation Team recommends that the programme reviews the volume of practical placement taking place outside the University (*see sub-section 2.1*).
3. The Evaluation Team recommends the input of visiting teachers, from other Lithuanian universities or from abroad (*see sub-section 3.4*).
4. The Evaluation Team recommends that the international activities of teaching staff should be better communicated to students (*see sub-section 3.6*).
5. The Evaluation Team recommends that students' IT skills and IT literacy should be more clearly supported. (*see sub-section 4.2*).
6. The Evaluation Team recommends that students' knowledge of foreign languages (especially English) should be improved; this would make students more willing to participate in international exchanges; this could be through a revision of the programme curriculum (increase the amount of credits allocated to foreign language: only up to 6 ECTS credits are given for foreign language, what is quite low, comparatively to other study programmes of the same type); it would also benefit students in the longer term, for their future career (*see sub-section 5.4*).
7. The Evaluation Team recommends a wider spread of marks, especially for the evaluation of final projects and Final Thesis (*see sub-section 5.6*).

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.
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 specialisations and competencies (e.g. drama director, puppet director, cultural event organiser) within one single programme (“BA Directing”) means that the programme may not be able to achieve all its ambitious intended aims and learning outcomes.
2. Although facilities are being improved and 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 7 recommendations are listed on the previous page.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme Directing (state code – **612W41005**) 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	3
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:	16

*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)