STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

# Kaunas

Vilniaus dailės akademijos

## ARCHITEKTŪROS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS (61205M103)

## VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

_____

## ASSESSMENT REPORT

of *ARCHITECTURE* (61205M103)
STUDY PROGRAMME

at Vilnius Academy of Arts, Kaunas Faculty

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader:     Prof. Spyros Amourgis

Grupės nariai:   Prof. Teresa Rovira
Team members:    Prof. Gerhard Meyer
                 Prof. Gintaras Čaikauskas

Vilnius
2010

**DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ**

| | |
| --- | --- |
| Studijų programos pavadinimas | *Architektūra* |
| Valstybinis kodas | 61205M103 |
| Studijų sritis | meno |
| Studijų kryptis | architektūra |
| Studijų programos rūšis | universitetinės studijos |
| Studijų pakopa | pirmoji |
| Studijų forma (trukmė metais) | nuolatinė (4), ištęstinė (5) |
| Studijų programos apimtis kreditais[1] | 160 |
| Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija | Architektūros bakalauras, architektas |
| Studijų programos įregistravimo data | 2001-08-02 |

_____

[1] – vienas kreditas laikomas lygiu 40 studento darbo valandų

_____

**INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAMME**

| | |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the study programme | *Architecture* |
| State code | 61205M103 |
| Study area | art |
| Study field | architecture |
| Kind of the study programme | university studies |
| Level of studies | first |
| Study mode  (length in years) | full-time (4), part time (5) |
| Scope of the study programme in national credits | 160 |
| Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded | Bachelor of Architecture, Architect |
| Date of registration of the study programme |  02-08- 2001 No. 1187 |

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

## I.    INTRODUCTION

The Panel of Experts (Professors: Gintaras Caikauskas, Gerhard Meyer, Teresa Rovira and Spyros Amourgis) visited Vilnius Academy of Fine Arts 'Kaunas Art Institute' Department of Architecture on Thursday the 4th of March, accompanied by Daiva Buivydiene from the LCQA. The group collectively met with the Administrative Staff of the Faculty of Architecture, the staff responsible for the preparation of the self evaluation report, with students and the teaching staff and with graduates and employers.

The Panel held discussions with all members of the Department that were present during the visit and had the opportunity to see all the teaching areas, including the rooms used for the computer teaching and the library. The panel of Experts also saw the exhibition of projects of students and visited also the closely located building (which is an empty old mental hospital building) which was given to the Department and is presently partly used on the ground floor by some students.

The Head of the Department, the teaching Faculty, the staff and students, and all participating visitors (alumni and employers) were open and responsive to the questions posed by the various experts of the panel. The Panel also appreciated the openness that were received by the Department of Architecture and would like to express their thanks for their warm welcome.
It appears that the Department is genuinely interested in maintaining the Bachelor in Architecture and has focused their energies in the Bachelors Programme. They have also made some efforts to improve parts of the building that houses the Department and have secured the adjacent old building (an old abandoned mental hospital) for future expansion. The Experts although they appreciated the efforts of the Department to find new spaces for teaching, they consider that the condition of the old building, which is in deteriorating state, is not fit and appropriate to let students use it as is.

## II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

### 2.1. Programme aims and intended learning outcomes

#### 2.1.1. Demand, purpose and aims of the programme

*Exceptionality and validity of the programme demand*

The department aims to define an identity for the architectural programme in the context of an Art Academy which is a legitimate objective. However the projects that were exhibited during the visit did not demonstrate the application of all the claims in the self evaluation report

for example utilization of passive systems in buildings (point 18 in p.8) in the self evaluation report regarding "ecological problems".

Over the last years, Lithuanian universities prepare a lot of architects (about 230 each year), and competition in this area in the market is very high. The graduates who acquire this professional knowledge find employment in different areas and the official education policy supports this demand as number of applicants is rising. Nevertheless, the number of very qualified specialists working in the field of Architecture remains very low.

What is apparently evident as different with this programme is the excessive emphasis on the appearance of the buildings and the aim to train 'creativity' with numerous "composition" courses in the curriculum. This emphasis is not balanced by equal emphasis on technology (structures, construction methods and details, energy conservation and mechanical systems) and other such areas equally important for the construction of buildings. Creativity in architecture is manifested not only by the form and the image of a building but the building as a whole responding equally imaginatively to all the above mentioned areas. Furthermore the emphasis on the appearance is a matter of subjective judgement that may appeal to few or many whereas, technological issues and other realistic factors in building are  essential for the stability and safety of a structure of a building, its efficient function serving human needs, comfort conditions for humans , and economic to run and maintain.  An art academy with more courses in art, aesthetics and humanities may make the students more sensitive to all these but not to the disadvantage of the other areas.

*Conformity of the programme purpose with institution, state or international directives*

The programme appears to meet minimum standard for training professional architects as far as quantitative aspects (credits, semesters etc). However in real learning terms the projects of the students that the Experts saw exhibited demonstrated serious weaknesses in understanding structural, constructional and environmental issues.

*Relevance of the programme aims*

The role of art in the education of architects within Kaunas Art Faculty must be redefined. Architecture is an "accountable" art responding with imagination to human needs, environmental and cultural factors, technology and cost efficiency.

The studies and Bachelor's degree in architecture  must satisfy  the professional qualification requirements.  The concept must not only meet the realities of life,  but also the requirements of the law related to design. The design must address the relationship between objects in the environment, land disposition, internal functional connections, and the interior offered  solutions. The final project of Bachelor of Architecture degree must demonstrate  the  creativity of the student, originality and  understanding of current architecture and relating academic and artistic

trends through technological knowledge gained and professional skills, as well as adequate analytical process and architectural design practical experience.

The final work and the project of the student must demonstrate creativity working with various sources of information and respectful to the Lithuanian culture. It also must consider architectural, structural and engineering systems as necessary for the project. As mentioned earlier student projects did not appear to respond to all those issues and particularly in their understanding of structural systems and constructional issues. Floor plans had only indiaction where columns should go without tentaive dimensions and elevations (facades)of buildings not showing how the floor slabs were supported by beams!

### 2.1.2. Intended learning outcomes of the programme studies

*Versatility and accessibility of intended learning outcomes of the study programme*

The self assessment report does not distinguish between the multitude of listed aims and learning outcomes. This offsets the potentially special character of the programme. For example the four learning outcomes listed in p.10, point 32 do not list the aspects of technology (structures) and materials as a distinct determining factor for designing buildings. An other issue is that it is not clear in the curriculum which of the listed courses is providing the necessary information and training to estimate ecological issues (see p.10 point 32 and p.12-14) .

*Conformity of the intended learning outcomes*

There is a poor correlation of learning outcomes of the programme level with those of the subject level. This is caused by the lack of clarity of the learning outcomes in the description of the courses and the curriculum. Examples of student projects that were exhibited, as mentioned before, showed that the emphasis was in the appearance of the buildings. It was noticed in the student drawings that elevations of building projects were not showing an understanding of how the building was supported structurally, for example openings were showing lack of beams to support floors as indeed the floor plans were only indicating the position of the columns without showing the approximate size of the columns as is normal practice in design presentation drawings. Also the design of elevations and the configuration of buildings exhibited did not show a clear understanding of the effects of orientation in the conservation of energy through passive systems and the effects of protection to the user of the interior in terms of human comfort.

*Renewability of the intended learning outcomes*

It appears that there is a lack of a system of continuous assessment. This is very serious as without monitoring and a feed-back of the learning outcomes it is almost impossible to assess objectively the necessary improvements in the teaching process.

Knowledge and abilities proposed in the programme are described in the self assessment: 1. Projecting (design) abilities; 2.Understanding of cultural context; 3.Social-ecological knowledge and 4.Skills of professional "cooperation", meaning perhaps (in the English text) supportive skills are without any reference to the procedures to check the results in learning and acquired abilities. It is also worth noting that in the above 4 critical areas there is no mention of the necessary knowledge areas of technology essential for the construction and function of a building.

## *2.2. Curriculum design*

### 2.2.1. Programme structure

*Suitability of the study scope*

The study scope generally complies with the statutory requirements set by the legal acts and other legal documents of the Republic of Lithuania regulating university studies. However this refers mainly to quantitative aspects.

The first cycle study programme of Architecture consists of 160 credits that correspond to 6400 hours (1 credit = 40 hours). The overall number of credits/hours complies with legal requirements.  The distribution between independent work and contact hours seems to be adequate the way it is performed.As reported in the interview (and documented in the self-evaluation report) students independent work consists of 5296 hours, i.e. almost 75% of the total time of the studies. Each module indicates the scope, content, and forms of independent work which is directly related to the aims of the academic subject and the intended learning outcomes. Independent work is cooperative consistent work of teacher and student. For the independent work to be effective, student has to learn to plan time, to observe the calendar plan, especially when writing essays, course papers, projects, and the final thesis.

*Consistency of the study subjects*

The emphasis on 'composition' against 'architectural building design' is inconsistent with the aim of training architects. As indeed the rather limited extend of technology subjects some of which are also introduced at the later semesters (six, seventh).

### 2.2.2. Programme content

*Conformity of the programme content with legal acts*

According to the submitted self-assessment material and information obtained during the meetings, the  experts understand that the architectural studies program is broadly consistent with "General requirements for study programs" confirmed by Minister of Education and Science on July 22, 2005, Order No. 1551. The study plan includes 7 subjects per semester what

is in correlation with the requirements. The program is 160 credits, and is divided to three different categories of units: Part A - items of general university education is 16 credits, i.e., 10% of the total study program (requirements of the volume shall be not less than 7%); part B - the framework of the program of study subjects for 70 credits (the volume of requirements must be at least 60 credits); part C - special education matters for 74 credits, i. e., 46% of the total study program(requirements specified volume must be at least 25%). Practices for 10 credits (requirements specify that it must be at least 10 credits). Final project preparation and defense are given 10 credits (requirements specify it must be at least 8 credits).

The programme seems to be in tune with regulations for the study field.

The credits and the legal requirements establish very basic quantitative requirements which may appear satisfactory while they may not address the specific requirements and the time they need to be taught certain subjects. The comments about weaknesses observed in the student projects that the experts saw indicate to curriculum weaknesses.

*Comprehensiveness and rationality of the programme content*

Methods of teaching rely mainly on consultations in the core subjects. Program of study is concentrated on conceptual beginnings of modern architecture, importance of stylistic expression, trends, and their artistic aspects. The experts do not see sufficient focus for the Bachelor degree qualifications on professional knowledge and training. The *Physics of building* is offered in the 4th year when is should be introduced, with calculations of structures in the earlier years. It seems that all the technology courses (Physics of Building, Structures, Heating, ventilation and cooling, Electrical systems and construction) are all taught in a total of 8 semesters when normlly structures alone require 8 semesters and construction and building materials together an other 8 semesters.

Summer practice is allocated too many credits.

## 2. 3. Staff

### 2.3.1. Staff recruitment

*Validity of the staff composition*

The experts acknowledge the staff qualifications, however the concentration of the teaching load, as listed in the programme, for several faculty seems excessive. On the other hand for the small number of students per class it sems a very expensive method to have two and three people to teach a course. Teachers' qualifications seem to be in accordance with university degree program requirements, at least half the quantity of each course of study is taught by academic teachers with appropriate degree or recognized architects such as - J. Audėjaitis, E. Miliūnas, R. J. Palys, A. Kančas, L. Tuleikis.

*The staff changes*

It seems that the staff numbers are rather set. It is always constructive to have some part time teaching faculty that rotate this way as new people bring fresh experiences to a programme. This is normal practice in some universities and it provides an opportunity to test people before they are offered a permanent position in a Department.

**2.3.2. Staff competence**

*Compliance of the staff experience and activities with the study programme*

The staff seems to be in compliance with the delivered study programme.

The experts noted an increase in the numbers of higher appointments. R. J. Palys and E. V. Miliūnas, V. Vaicekauskas and J. Audėjaitis were promoted to Professors, L. Tuleikis, E. Jackus became Associate Professors and Dr. J. Palaima began work in the department. Three lecturers of the department have a doctoral qualification degree. The qualification composition of the department faculty corresponds to the Statute of VAA. The lecturers, who work in the programme of professional education of architecture, are specialists of in practice and theory, they also claim that they are also well known all over Lithuania and abroad.

Professional work is important in the field of architecture for those teaching design, as research work and publications are more usual for architecture historians, urban planners and those dealing with structures, mechanical systems and the environment. <span style="color:red">The ballance between elder and middle generation of staff in the Faculty, is 18 out of 33 teaching staff are between 50-70 years old ,6 between 40-49 years old and only 9 between 30-39 years old. The younger generation of the architectural teaching staff could be presented more videly as well as woman could be involved in the existing staff members.</span>

*Consistency of teachers' professional advancement*

The teachers seem to be rather active professionally and their experience useful in their teaching. Prof. J. Audėjaitis has designed the business leader center in Donelaičio str. 62 in Kaunas, hotel SANTAKA reconstruction and extension, J. Gruodžio str. 21 in Kaunas, some residential quarters in Kaunas, etc., took part in some conferences abroad.

Assoc Prof. E. V. Miliūnas is one of the country's most famous architect who designed and realized number of significant projects: entertainment and sports Kaunas Areena and the public infrastructure of the Nemunas Island, King Mindaugas Ave. 50, Šiauliai Aukštabalis multifunctional complex, J. Jablonskis str.16, M. Žilinskas art gallery in Kaunas and others. In recent years, worked as a trainee in the U.S. and the Netherlands. For artistic merit is rewarded with prizes, give the names of honor.

Assoc. Prof. A. Kančas is active architect who realized following projects: the Good Shepherd Church, shopping and entertainment center "Akropolis", Kaunas Drama Theatre renovations, residential district "Freda town", the "Mercury" commercial administrative building of apartments in Laisvės al., Pažaislis guest house for tourism in Kaunas, etc. Recently, he took part in various training workshops in the U.S., Germany, Spain, Greece, Italy, Spain, and Holland. His is winner of many architectural competitions.

Assoc. Prof. R.J.Palys - Kaunas original artist who realized the following items: "Santaka" hotel in Kaunas, Smalininkų str., "DOLETA "office building in Kaunas, Jonava str.16, Vytautas Magnus (Aleksotas) bridge across Nemunas river in Kaunas, reconstruction of the bridge with MK viaducts in Kaunas via Nemunas, produced other projects. Has won prizes in architectural competitions.

Assoc. Prof. L. Tuleikis has designed a commercial centre "Akropolis" in Kaliningrad (Russia), Multifunctional cultural centre "Šiauliai Arena", together with „E. Miliūno studija", Reval Neris Hotel reconstruction in Kaunas, Apartment house "Vila Domino" in Žaliasis slėnis, participated in architectural competitions: „Lukiškių square", „Lituanika quarter", „Exhibition pavilion in Palanga", etc.

## 2.4. Material resources

### 2.4.1. Facilities

*Sufficiency and suitability of premises*

Facilities are very poor and insufficient, there is lack of studio permanent workspaces, essential to teaching architectural design. Library is extremely poor in books and foreign publications. Architectural magazines are very limited. Architecture depends for teaching on examples from many countries There is no model workshop. Students were observed working and building models during the visit of the experts on the corridors and entrance lobby of the building. Although this is unacceptable the experts express their respects for the students sporting spirit accepting such conditions. The use of the adjacent building for teaching purposes, abandoned (mental hospital) for many years, it is unacceptable because of the unhealthy and dilapidated conditions. The computer laboratory must keep being upgraded as IT technology continuously changes, and should have more work-stations available to students at all hours until late at night for them to practice.

*Suitability and sufficiency of equipment for studies*

In a Department of Architecture it is necessary to have a well equipped workshop to have the students make models and a well stocked with printers and various software computer lab. As mentioned in the previous paragraph in detail although some rooms in the architecture building

have been upgraded the rest of the facilities need to be improved and additional space must be found. The old hospital building next door should not be used until it is repaired and upgraded. In this condition it should be condemned as unhygienic if not unhealthy. And other reason of course is what kind of message it gives to students who learn how to design new spaces for human uses?

*Sufficiency and accessibility of resources for undergoing practical training*

Practical training is dealt during holidays at teachers´ offices at risk of raising concerns about conflict of interest.  It is quite normal practice elsewhere, when there are not many private companies, for students to do practical work with Municipal and Government technical departments during summer holidays to gain practical experience.

### 2. 4.2. Learning resources

*Suitability and accessibility of books, textbooks and periodical publications*

A proper and well stocked library is missing. The present library needs to be expanded and provide reading space as well electronic access for the students while they are in the building. It also needs to be able to meet the demands of the excessive course descriptions bibliographies. Electronic magazines are a must for university libraries.

*Suitability and accessibility of learning materials*

The library appears to be unable to support the demands of publications of the course descriptions. Normally for each course there should be a list of several books/publications to expand the students learning.   Students have mentioned that faculty lend them from their private offices books or architectural magazines. Efforts must be made to join the other universities and share the cost of electronic material.

## 2.5. Study process and assessment

### 2. 5.1. Student admission

*Reasonableness of the requirements for admission to studies*

The self-analys group states that from 2009 the system of students' admission to architecture study programme was changed toward the needs of technical universities and there was no possibility to select students whose abilities are more suitable to study architecture at KAF. The best competitive grade in 2009 was 20,26 which is fairly low and the lowest (after an extra admission) – 10,6 which is very low indeed, for candidates who will become  professionals one day. The old system up to 2008 was good as it allowed an interview to assess the abilities of future students. However as the present system of exams includes art test and drawing skills is

still filtering students who may potentially become architects. The present  system also is more transparent and perhaps more fair .

*Motivation enhancement efficiency of future and new students*

It is noted that in order to attract the most capable students, KAF applies a certain amount of means: participate in a high school fair, organizes the presention of the program during the „open days", organizes various visits with expositions  to Kaunas and Kaunas' region schools, advertise the progam in different kind of media and website. In order to attract  the students, KAF organizes special preparational courses which strengthen and widen candidates' abilities of general art. The accpeted students are encouraged to participate in international competitions abroad as well as in national and local competitions. The information of newest architecture tendencies are widely disseminated in order to stimulate the student to feel a part of  European architecture schools.

The experts appreciate the process and method of selection of students by the Department even though in spite of the efforts taken the numbers of recruitment of new students remain small.

### 2.5.2. Study process

*Rationality of the programme schedule*

According to the self- analysis report, the timetable is arranged in such a way that subject blocks of different programmes would be taught during diverse days. Practical subjects are followed by theoretical subjects on different days. All lectures are held in two of KAF buildings which are close to each other. The students did not have any complains about programme shedule. The schedule of the programme can be improved in some areas more specifically the physics of buildings should be taught at an earlier year.

Three weeks are devoted to an exam session. Practical works, completed during the semester, are exhibited on the same day and their review takes for three days (discussions with the students, the assessment of the department and methodological committee).The exams of theoretical subjects are organized every three weeks. The organization of exam session seems to be good.

*Student academic performance*

There is basically almost no attrition of students.The architecture students „drop outs"of first level university studies is insignificant (approximately 2,5 %).  Such situation is influenced by sufficient initial readines and clear motivation. Also, according to the university regulations, students are able to interrupt their studies and then return to the program and continue within three years (about 2/3 students resume their studies).

*Mobility of teachers and students*

Despite the statement that international mobility is becoming more active (in 2008/09 academic year three of students studied at three different Western European universities and three staff members went abroad under the Erasmus ( Socrates) academic exchange programme. The faculty are conscious that mobility of teachers and students is insufficient. Teachers are not informed about possibilities of mobility and the students receive their information via alternative sources. This lack of interest should be corrected and a faculty member should be assigned as liaison to these opportunities, as is done in other universities in other E.U.States.

### 2. 5.3. Student support

*Usefulness of academic support*

There is no structured process of student counselling however there are informal efforts taken. Counselling is normally required of the teaching faculty as part of their duties each week, over and above the teaching hours.

*Efficiency of social support*

Grants are limited; social activities seem to be initiated by the students. The students´ club is located in the dilapidated building but usable only at risk of their health.

### 2. 5.4. Achievement assessment

*Suitability and publicity of assessment criteria*

There are no fixed and structured assessment criteria, as stated in the self-evaluation report (p.25, point 108 "assessment does not have a formal expression". As intended learning outcomes are not formulated in the level of subject, there is no correlation with assessment criteria even in informal way.

The grades are given for course work and at the exams of theoretical subjects. According to the the information provided „during the exam session works are assessed by the agreed criterion: 1. the precission of decision; 2. the originality of works, up – to – dateness, expressiveness; 3. Aesthetic, technical fulfillment; 4. methods and system of work; 5. independence of work" Although the experts did not receive the information how the the criteria of students' achievement assesment are presented to the students, the above assessment criteria mentioned in the self evaluation report illustrate clearly how technologic subjects are down played in the curriculum, as is also mentined in other parts of this report.

*Feedback efficiency*

Feedback is delivered only informally. In the written exams and papers or written tests the teaching responsibility of a faculty is complete when the student receives written comments explaining what was wrong in their test or exam.

*Efficiency of graduation papers assessment*

The requirements for the final works of bachelor's studies are set by the specific Department and the Board of faculty. The topics of final works and supervisors are suggested by the department and approved by the Dean of KAF. The public defence of final works is held in public places accessible to the society. The self assessment report ( points 113) does not define if there are no guest critics in the defense presentation of the diploma projects. The invitation of outside critics to participate in the reviews is universally considered as a good practice as it brings a fresh point of view by the outsider and it adds credibility to the whole process.

*Functionality of the system for recognition of achievements acquired in a non-formal and self-study*

There is no non- formal education organized by the Department. Except the practical experience which is done in the summer, at the faculty offices.

### 2.5.5. Graduates placement

*Expediency of graduate placement*

The experts met with graduates from the previous years . According to statistical data (point 115), the general number of employability of the graduates reaches 80%, including those who have already worked in the offices during their studies. In 2009, due to the economic situation, only those graduates found jobs as architects who were earlier employed in architectural studios. Although not all graduates succeed to find jobs, they take part in architectural competitions. The data of questionnaires of the department demonstrates that the graduates of the Architecture Department work mostly at architectural offices. It is difficult to assess how the employment situation will develop while there is an economic crisis in the E.U.

## 2. 6. Programme management

### 2.6.1. Programme administration

*Efficiency of activities by the programme management*

The Head of the Department is also the coordinator of the programme. At the moment this function is performed by Edmundas Jackus, who is a practicing architect, and is head of the Architecture. The students are also involved (students' union delegate 2 students to the Board of KAF, also there is a students reperesentative at the methodological committee of the department). The employers are involved not direcly, as the faculty are also practicing architects are also the employers represent both sides. Therefore, the composition of the program management is considered (by the Department) that has representatives from all relevant parties!!!The Experts consider these exceptions that the faculty cover both academic and

employers representation to the Board, that the students work for practical experience in the faculty offices during the summer. Simply not to have fresh points of view brought in the Department processes and more transparency to the function of the Department is not good practice.

### 2.6.2. Internal quality assurance

*Suitability of the programme quality assessment*

There is no specific information included in the self evaluation report except general comments about student responses, neither samples of the type of questionnaire used for student responses. The proposed evaluation planned by the Department (P.30, Point 140) is useful only as a consultation to help decide on curriculum changes. While evaluation procedures are valid only when they are conducted by an independent party and distant from the one to be evaluated.

*Efficiency of the programme quality improvement*

Quality improvement is an internal on-going process. It is setting internal standards and goals and then, from year to year, trying to achieve them. This is done by establishing an internal process and administrative unit representative of the various stake holders that monitor all quality assessment activities. The program administration organized anonymous students enquiries asking to evaluate the necessity of taught subjects and the quality of lecturers' work were conducted in 2007. Generally the results of the questionaires appear to be positive and helpful to improvements based on the to students' constructive suggestions while improving study programmes, correcting study modules and teaching methods. Nevertheless, the department has found this way of communication rather formal and communication was replaced „by lively interviews with active students in which they expressed their opinions about the study programme". This way of quality improvement can hardly be assessed as internal on-going process of quality assessment.

The anonymous student questionaires are by now universally accepted as an esential and objective method of student participation. The Department again makes an exception of standard practices that is convenient but contrary to inter –European and international good practices.

*Efficiency of social partaker participation*

Due to the information provided, the students of architecture programs actively take part in the activities, although there in no evidence of their participation in quality assesssment process and their initiatives for this process. Lecturers who do not belong to administration and methodological committee of faculty take part in the process of the quality of studies more informally.

Architectural organizations *Lithuanian Architects Association* and *Lithuanian Architects Chamber* could be considered to be the main social study partners which prepare the exhibitions of students work and have not direct influence on the quality of study program. The producers of building materials organize seminars for KAF students. The representatives of the employers take part during the assessment of the final works and express their comments about students' preparation.

## III. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1. New spaces offered to students, at the old mental hospital building, are unhealthy and unsuitable for architectural education. Until they are properly repaired and cleaned, students should not be allowed to use them.

3.2. The focus on Art is to the detriment of the Architectural education. The fact that education is offered by an Art Academy does not alter the need to educate architects thoroughly in technological subjects as well.

3.3. Learning outcomes must be focused, realistic and then implemented (see comments about ecology, environment and technology).

3.4. The number of credits employed in composition shall be reduced, and at the same time the technical subjects shall get more credits and taught earlier in the program, see also comments in paragraphs 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.2.2. regarding curriculum improvements.

3.5. Summer practice is given too many credit units and would be more beneficial to the students to experience other architects as well other than their teachers only in order to further expand their practical knowledge .

3.6. The teacher's assessments are informal and have to be formally structured and results must be properly processed to be of value.

3.7. The distribution of workload among teacher should be improved and teaching faculty must be used more efficiently, one person per each course.

3.8. It is necessary to improve the computer laboratory, equip the library and provide student permanent work stations.

3.9. The Department must adopt a more open policy and compare itself and learn from other international examples of good practices that are of course applicable to Lithuania. Academies of Art or Technical Universities in Europe, can not vary in essentials how they prepare architects as professionals.