



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

LIETUVOS EDUKOLOGIJOS UNIVERSITETO

VEIKLOS VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW REPORT

OF LITHUANIAN UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL

SCIENCES

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Brian O'Connor
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Jacques Lanares Prof. Peadar Cremin Bastian Baumann Virginija Rupainienė Gintarė Alaburdaitė
Vertinimo sekretorius: Review secretary:	Dr Gillian King

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	3
II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT THE INSTITUTION.....	3
III. STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT	4
IV. ACADEMIC STUDIES AND LIFE-LONG LEARNING	8
V. RESEARCH AND ART.....	10
VI. IMPACT ON REGIONAL AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	13
VII. BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
VIII. JUDGEMENT	17
ANNEX. HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION RESPONSE TO REVIEW REPORT	

I. INTRODUCTION

Short description of review process and review team

1. The review of the **Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (referred to below as “LUES” or “the University”)** was organised by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (SKVC), Lithuania, in its role as the Authorized Agency prescribed by Lithuanian law. The review was conducted in accordance with the prescribed methodology according to the Procedure for the External Review in Higher Education approved by Government Resolution No 1317 of 22 September, 2010.
2. The University submitted a Self Assessment Report (SAR) with Annexes, and further documentation as requested by the review team. The review team visited the University from 24 – 26 April 2012 and conducted several meetings with the University.
3. The University’s Self Assessment Report was made available in translation for the team. The team considered that there could have been a greater amount of self-reflection and self-evaluation in the report, which was largely descriptive. This is, of course, the first time that the University has taken part in an institutional-level external review, and therefore the first SAR produced for such external purposes.
4. ***The team recommends that it would be beneficial for the University to develop further its capacity for effective self-analysis.***
5. The expert review team explored the four principal areas of the University’s activity as set out in the ‘Methodology for Conducting an Institutional Review in Higher Education’ (referred to below as “the Methodology”): strategic planning, academic studies and life-long learning, research and/or art activities, and impact on regional and national development. Within each area of activity the review team made appropriate reference to the criteria set out in the Methodology and took due account of the lists of sub-criteria in reaching their decision. The experts have also been presented with the results of the evaluation of learning resources and associated infrastructure conducted by MOSTA and with the evaluation decision of 22 June 2012.
6. The expert team consisted of: team leader: Brian O’Connor; team members: Prof. Jacques Lanars, Prof. Peadar Cremin, Bastian Baumann, Virginija Rupainienė, Gintarė Alaburdaitė; review secretary: Dr Gillian King.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT THE INSTITUTION

7. The Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences is the main institution in Lithuania preparing a wide range of qualified professionals for the education sector in Lithuania.
8. The history of the University goes back to 1935, when the National Pedagogical Institute was established in Klaipėda following the Law on Pedagogical Institutes. The Institute eventually moved to the capital under the name of Vilnius Pedagogical Institute. In 1992, the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania granted the status of a university and approved the Statute of Vilnius Pedagogical University. Following the Law on Higher Education and Research (2009), the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania approved the new Statute of the University on 19 May 2011. This designated the University as a public institution with the title of “Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences”.
9. The University consists of 9 faculties (Education Studies, History, Mathematics and Information Technologies, Natural Sciences, Lithuanian Philology, Philology, Physics and Technology, Social Sciences, Sport and Health Education) and 2 institutes (Institute of Professional Competence Development and Institute of Social Communication).

10. Study programmes in all three cycles are offered by the University, including 37 first cycle study programmes, 30 second cycle programmes, and 4 third cycle programmes. In 2011, 1906 bachelors and 246 masters graduated from the University, and 17 doctoral students successfully defended their theses.
11. There are 434 full-time teachers employed at the University including 225 doctors and 43 Doctors Habilitatus.
12. The mission of the University is reflected in its 2006-10 Strategic Plan: “to educate members of the society in accordance with the contemporary education philosophy and most recent scientific knowledge”.
13. The University’s aim is to consolidate its exclusive position as a university of educational sciences in the area of higher education in Lithuania and the European Union. The University is guided by its fundamental values of legitimacy and fairness, gender equality and tolerance, national identity and citizenship awareness, openness to the world, and global responsibility.

III. STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

14. The review team explored the strategic management of LUES with reference to the criteria set out in the Methodology and considered the strategic plan’s fitness for purpose, arrangements for the plan’s publicity and its availability to stakeholders and the public at large, guarantees for its implementation, and management effectiveness.
15. The University SAR used the Strategic Plan 2006-2010 as the starting point for an analysis of its strategic management. The review team studied this document in detail, together with materials which explained how the University introduced, implemented and monitored this plan. The five year plan is supported by three year and one year plans. With respect to its **fitness for purpose**, the review team found that the 2006-10 Plan took into account the University’s mission, strategic documents on national policy, and in general, the principles of the European Higher Education Area (but see below).
16. As far as the **publicity, accessibility and availability of the strategic** plan were concerned, the team was told in meetings that the university operated a democratic consultation process on the drawing up of the plan involving the academic community at various levels in the University. The strategic plan was discussed in working groups that had wide membership of university staff. Faculties and student representative bodies were involved in the consultation process. The 2006-10 strategic plan is available on the University’s website.
17. With respect to **guarantees for implementation** of the plan, the team was mindful that the situation in higher education in Lithuania is changing rapidly and the specific position of the University within that environment has required the University to be flexible in its planning and responsive to environmental changes. However, the team considered that, while the University has made strenuous efforts to cope with environmental change and to preserve its contribution to training education professionals, nevertheless there are flaws in its strategic planning processes. For example, documentation that the team received suggested that the establishment of the Academic Quality Centre (a key player in monitoring of the Strategic Plan) was a very recent occurrence, agreed by a resolution of Senate in April 2012; tracking of progress on indicators of the Strategic Plan did not appear to be systematic, and the team could not see how some of the indicators could be followed through from year to year. Faculties also develop their own 5 year plans which are expected to be in accord with the University plan, but the process by which Faculty plans are agreed and monitored at the higher university level was not clear.
18. The team understood that the Rector’s annual report was the main vehicle for reporting on progress on the Strategic Plan to Senate and Council and this report is a detailed one. However, it was not evident to the team how subsequent action was coordinated in the

- University. The University itself points to a lack of coherence and absence of clear priorities to ensure the effectiveness of management, and the team would agree with this conclusion.
19. In assessing of **management effectiveness**, the team considered the effectiveness of internal quality assurance mechanisms. The team heard that, while some components of the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) were complied with in the University, implementation of ESG was at an early stage and not systematic throughout the University. The team could find no evidence of a process whereby the level of a University award is matched to the level descriptors of the European Qualifications Framework or National Qualifications Framework. It was not evident from the course descriptions how this was done.
 20. In general, the University's quality assurance processes for study programmes are at an early stage, although there is an external programme accreditation process. The team heard that the University is working on a quality assurance strategy which will allow quality processes to be designed in an integrated way; current processes will be integrated into the overall system. The team noted that Committees of the Study Programme (programme study committees) were introduced just over a year ago with the intention of increasing student-centredness. Quality assurance processes are overseen by the Programme study committees, which have representatives from all levels of the University. The team heard some evidence that there was inconsistency in the operation of study committees across the Faculties.
 21. The University requires that student evaluation questionnaires are carried out in all Faculties. However, the team heard that there is inconsistency across the University in how these questionnaires are designed, whether students are involved in the design, and whether any information on the results of the evaluations is fed back to students.
 22. *The review team recommends that the University quickly finalises its strategy for quality assurance in order to ensure consistent operation of quality assurance mechanisms across the University, paying due regard to European Standards and Guidelines.*
 23. In terms of enhancing the quality of programmes the team noted that the University has instituted a complete updating of its programmes in 2008-9. The length of the teaching practice period has also been extended and the team consider these developments to be a feature of best practice. The credit awarded for TP has also been increased to 30 ECTS. It was obvious from the students whom the review team met that the changes to programmes were appreciated by students and had benefited them. The University also introduced a motivation test in recent years and this has contributed significantly to identifying students who are motivated towards careers in teaching.
 24. Faculties provide information to students via the website. The team was also told that some students received a handbook, while others were given information about their courses in their first lecture. The University has started to use Moodle and WebCT to provide a Virtual Learning Environment for students and staff. Use of the VLE is at an early stage and some students were unclear as to its availability but the team heard that the University has organized a seminar on Moodle and there is some pilot work on blended learning taking place.
 25. The team noted that there was some staff development activity in the University and considered that the competition process for filling staff posts was a contribution to maintaining the quality of staff and giving them an incentive to upgrade their professional qualifications and also to perform their roles satisfactorily. However, the team considered that some of the teaching methods being employed could reflect more up to date pedagogic practices – such as active learning – which students will encounter and need to be able to implement in schools. As noted above, staff are being introduced to the virtual learning environment as a vehicle for posting study materials and communicating with students, but this is not yet university-wide. Use of interactive white boards is also increasing as these become more prevalent in schools.

26. There is evidence that the University collects some statistical data about its students and the team saw progression and retention data for some categories of students. There are also systems for HR and finance functions. However, the team could find no strategic approach to the implementation and use of these systems, and at present the various IT systems are not connected.
27. Decision-making in the University is democratic: many bodies are involved and there is a distribution of responsibilities with appropriate subsidiarity. Students are represented on all major University bodies and each Faculty has a Student Council.
28. Human resources are largely apportioned according to the number of programmes and student numbers mainly based on study programmes. There is a standard ratio of staff numbers to student numbers. Funding for programmes is agreed at the beginning of the year.
29. State budget funding has been falling since 2008 in common with national trends, and project and research funding has been used to help fill funding gaps. Projects pursued have not always been those that best fit the University's core mission. For example, some research areas do not seem to relate to the pedagogical mission of the university. The team questioned whether this is a sustainable strategy. The team considered the new library to be an example of project funding which had been slow to achieve its objective (see below).
30. The review team heard that the University could foresee decreases in its student numbers as a result of external challenges such as increased competition in provision of teacher education. This was not seen as necessarily bad by the University: it could result in the University becoming a type of elite university producing graduates which were even more in demand by the education sector. Against this vision, the University also indicated its social mission to accept students from small towns and remote places, and from poor families. The University noted the difficulty that such candidates had in paying fees but also their strong vocation to become teachers.
31. Research funding doubled in the period 2005-2008 and, while it has decreased since that time, the level of funding per staff member is still more than twice what it was in 2005 and is equivalent to 13% of the University's income throughout this period. The SAR does not delineate the levels of funding generated by the two categories (teaching and research) of staff. Table 3.10 indicates that the share of funding allocated for the results of research production assessment was steadily increasing from 8.6 % in 2005 to 17.6 % in 2010. The fact that over 17% of the University's funding is generated in this manner makes a significant contribution to financial sustainability.
32. As far as the team could see the Faculties use the funds for the purposes for which they have been allocated. The Strategic Planning Group is responsible for monitoring of spending.
33. In terms of management of learning resources the team saw that some computer laboratories have been refurbished, that there are specialist laboratories, and the classroom that the team visited had a smart board and flexible space. The team commends this updated, flexible teaching space but suggests that it might be used more creatively, for example, by using active learning methods that students are likely to encounter in schools.
34. The University is currently building a new library. Projected to have been completed in 2009, reduction in funding has meant that it is now anticipated to be finished in 2013. In the meantime the University has invested further in the current library building, including improving its insulation. Furthermore books in Faculty libraries have been centrally catalogued and cannot be borrowed, helping to protect book stock. There was evidence of the provision of online catalogue and e-books.
35. The University has had a Code of Ethics since 2001 and recently updated version is available on the website. Staff are not required to sign the Code and the team did not hear of any procedures to ensure compliance with the Code.
36. The most concerning finding of the team in the area of strategic management was that, whereas the former Strategic Plan expired in 2010, no current Strategic Plan had been agreed

by the University. This situation has arisen because there is currently no Council of the University. During the period, which this external review of the University covers, there were various changes to Higher Education law in Lithuania. During the same period (on 19 May 2011) the University (at that stage, Vilnius Pedagogic University) received a Resolution of the Seimas the Republic of Lithuania which approved its change of name, gave it a new Statute, and designated it as a public institution. Amongst other matters the new Statute addressed the management and governance of the University, and the structure and functions of the Council of the University. The latter functions were different from those of the Council which existed in the University up to that time. It is unfortunate that, after receiving its new Statute, the University planned only to elect its new Council in December 2011 (some six months after the Seimas Resolution). However, the consideration of the 2009 Law on Higher Education and Research (which defined the new functions of the Council) by the Constitutional Court in 2011 meant that the election of the new Council in the University did not take place, and the University has now been without a Council for over a year. The review team heard from members of the former Council that they had not served since 2010.

37. The University's SAR states that "*University Council represents the University in its relations with state authorities... It should be noted that the Rector, while exercising the functions directly assigned by the Statute, shall take into account the conclusions and proposals of the Council. The conclusions, proposals and reports of the Council are not binding on Rector's institution, but the Rector shall justify why he does not agree with the decision of the Council.*" The Council, therefore, provides some external scrutiny of the functions of the Rector, and decisions of the Senate. The review team heard that the Council had previously commented on scarcity of funding in the University and rigorously scrutinized the Rector's annual report. In addition the Council had been informed of decisions concerning approval of the Strategic Plan and distribution of finance to Faculties. No such ongoing external scrutiny has been present in the University since the last Council was disbanded, and the review team was told that functions of the Council have been taken over by the Senate. Ongoing external scrutiny of the University's strategic and management activities is, therefore, no longer possible, and the team considers that this lack of external input is unsatisfactory.
38. ***The review team recommends that without delay the University ensures that arrangements are made so that appropriate external scrutiny is applied to the decisions of its major decision-making bodies.***
39. While the new strategic plan has not yet been agreed, the University provided an abstract from the proposed Plan for 2012-2020. This indicates the University's Mission and Vision and four directions: strategic management and administration, studies and lifelong learning, research, and impact on national development. Each direction has associated strategic goals, objectives and indicators on which analysis of the plan's progress will be based. The abstract which the team saw included a small sample of the indicators to be used. The abstract also noted the main targets and products which would be monitored, the methods of monitoring, and it indicated the Academic Quality Centre as having the main role for monitoring. While this structure indicates that there is the potential for successful implementation and monitoring of the plan, it is obviously too early for the review team to know whether these aspirations will be realized. The team cannot, therefore, form a view on the management effectiveness of the Strategic Plan 2012-2020.
40. It is worth noting that the abstract of the 2012-2020 Plan itself contains a goal to '*institutionalise the system of strategic planning*'. An associated measure to attain this objective is '*Preparation of a methodology for strategic planning in the University*'. The intended outcome is '*Preparation of methodology for strategic planning, which establishes principles of preparing strategic development and activity plans of the University and its subdivisions, as well as their content and form*'. This indicates that the University itself

considers its current strategic planning mechanisms to require improvement and institutionalizing, and the team agrees with this.

41. Bearing in mind its comments above about coherence of management (see paragraphs 17 and 18) ***the review team recommends that the University ensures that its new Strategic Plan is approved without delay and that particular attention is paid to ensuring coherent mechanisms are in place for implementation and monitoring of the Plan.***
42. In summary, the strengths of the University's strategic management include the inclusive process used to draw up the strategic plan, the establishment of Programme Study Committees, the lengthening of the Teaching Practice period, the operation of a motivation test, the stringent competition process for filling staff posts, and the provision of updated, flexible teaching spaces. Weaknesses identified by the team include flaws in the operation of the strategic management process, implementation of the ESG and quality assurance processes in general are at an early stage, inconsistency in the use of student evaluation questionnaires across the university, some out of date pedagogic practices, the lack of connection between major IT systems, the lack of a current strategic plan and lack of external input to the decision-making of the Senate and Rector, formerly provided by the Council.
43. **The team's judgement on the area of Strategic Management is a negative**

IV. STUDIES AND LIFE-LONG LEARNING

44. The review team explored academic studies and life-long learning of LUES with reference to the criteria set out in the Methodology and considered their compliance with the requirements for Lithuanian higher education and harmonisation with the principles of the European Higher Education Area.
45. The team noted that the programmes and life-long learning provision offered were compliant with the University's mission and also contributed to meeting the needs of the national economy and social and cultural development. In particular, approximately 75% of state-funded students chose entry to the University in 2010-11. The University thus makes a major contribution to teacher education in Lithuania.
46. There is a significant number and wide range of programmes at all three levels. As described above in 2008-9 the University instituted a programme updating process and has merged and cancelled some programmes. The team consider this to be a feature of best practice in ensuring that the University's provision remains relevant. Many programmes are interdisciplinary and focus on both pedagogical preparation for teaching and a subject area. Students are therefore prepared for the possibility of entry into more than one profession.
47. Life-long learning includes various forms of study: full-time, part-time and transfer from one cycle to another. There are also individual plans of study as well as the regular programmes on offer.
48. The University accredits prior learning and credit obtained on some exchange schemes.
49. As noted above, students are represented on all major committees in the University, including the Attestation Committee which decides the outcome of the staff competition process. Students were involved in the consultation about the strategic plan, and also in the 2008-9 programme updating process. The review team heard while involvement in decision-making at the Faculty level could be patchy, at the level of Senate the student voice was heard and students voted on all major areas of the University's activities.
50. Programmes are drawn up according to a standard format which involves completion of a course description. Examples that the team saw were detailed and thorough. They included learning outcomes linked to programme content and assessment. Students and staff appeared to have access to the descriptors and make some use of them. The descriptors are given to some students in their first lecture. The team was told that there is a system of learning outcomes assessment, that students have opportunity to input into choice of

assessment methods, and that learning outcomes were a focus of strategic plan implementation; nevertheless it was not clear to the team that learning outcomes were in everyday use everywhere in the University, or whether all staff had a clear understanding of the concept and need for clear articulation of learning outcomes.

51. ***The team recommends that learning outcomes should be linked to the level descriptors of the European Qualifications Framework and that there should be consistent use of learning outcomes in the operation and assessment of programmes; learning outcomes should be more actively implemented. This may necessitate in depth consideration of learning and teaching methods to ensure that learning outcomes are delivered.***
52. There is close contact with the University's social and business partners and the team heard that to some social partners the association is invaluable. The team heard that the previous council had reviewed programmes and the study process with social partners and had assessed how well the University meets external demands and the real life situation. Social partners are also involved in Programme Study Committees and are invited to meet students as part of the feedback process. Feedback from social partners, as well as from students, contributes towards the modification of programmes and to the introduction of new ones. The review team considers the close and long-standing relationship of the University to its social partners to be a feature of best practice.
53. In terms of compliance with the provisions of the European Higher Education Area, the situation with regard to the ESG has been discussed above. As stated above the team could find no process whereby new programmes were linked to level descriptors although staff whom the team met were acquainted with the Dublin descriptors. It was noted that students received a Diploma Supplement (DS) and that this was longstanding practice. The DS was provided in both Lithuanian and English.
54. There are several examples of international mobility of staff and students. Staff reported support for work abroad and noted that the Erasmus programme helps University staff to travel and bring new understanding and skills back to the University. Furthermore, scholars also come to the University facilitating working together and bringing new experience in teaching and research methods. Support staff also emphasised the importance of international links: the team was told that mobility and expansion of international contacts was important to the University and that there were already established agreements with institutions but that the University was also looking for further opportunities for students and staff.
55. In student exchanges, outgoing students are more numerous than incoming. Indeed, there are more students in the University wishing to travel than places available for them. The team heard from students of some of the barriers to taking up an exchange place. The likelihood of having to give up a job in Lithuania with no guarantee of another on the student's return was seen as a major barrier. Language problems were also thought to inhibit exchanges. The cost of travel was also perceived by students to be a barrier. The team suggests that the University consider ways to overcome these barriers which might include seeking partner universities which could provide cost effective exchange places for students, and the provision of language learning in the University, for incoming as well as outgoing students. Some students said that information on exchanges was not always readily accessible and the team suggests that the University should address this.
56. In summary, the strengths of the University include the major contribution that it makes to teacher education in Lithuania, student involvement in decision-making, close and long-standing contact with social partners, and the long-standing practice of issuing a Diploma Supplement. Weaknesses identified by the team include the lack of a study plan before a student participates in an overseas exchange programme leading, on occasion, to no credit being awardable for the overseas studies, the incomplete understanding and use of learning outcomes in all phases of the learning and teaching process, and the barriers encountered by students who wished to participate in overseas exchanges.

57. **The team's judgement on the area of Studies and Life-Long Learning is a positive.**

V. RESEARCH AND ART

58. The review team explored research and art activities in the University with reference to the criteria set out in the Methodology and considered the relevance, international links and harmonisation of research/art activities in the University with the provisions of the European Research Area.
59. During the period under review, doctoral students have been enrolled in the areas of Biology, Education, History, Philology, Physics and Psychology. In 2011, 1906 bachelors and 246 masters graduated from the University, and 17 doctoral students successfully defended their theses. This indicates that of 2169 graduates, fewer than 1% (0.78%) are graduating at PhD level.
60. The SAR (Introduction) states that "there are 434 full-time teachers employed at the University including 225 doctors and 43 Doctors Habilitatus". This means that 62% of the Institution's full-time teachers are qualified to doctoral level. There seems to be considerable capacity among the faculty to attract and supervise higher numbers of doctoral students.
61. The team explored the **relevance of the University's research activities to its mission and strategy** and noted that the SAR discusses the relevance of research and art activities within the context of the University Strategy for research in the period 2006-2010. (As noted above, there is currently no approved Strategic Plan in the University). Chapter 3 of the SAR identifies the four issues on which there was a focus during the period 2005-2010. Three of them might be expected in the context of a University of Educational Sciences. However, the fourth refers to prioritising the "development of applied science research" without making any reference to the specific area of educational sciences..
62. This suggests that there is some degree of tension in relation to the consistency of research and art activities (as the SAR itself notes in the discussion of its prospects under Research and Arts) , and the team also encountered this in its discussions with staff. There seems to be a lack of overall clarity on the relative merits of research-based education as opposed to education-based research. This view is reinforced by the data in the SAR which shows that approximately two-thirds of the University's research publications in the period 2005-2010 were in the field of humanities together with the physical, biomedical and technological sciences, with the remaining one-third relating to education. Despite this, the SAR comments that, "Thus, educational publications more than twice outnumbered the publications in other sciences. Prevalence of educational publications in the University's research is an indication of purposeful attempt to implement the potential of the University's educational profile and its educational mission."
63. The SAR also distinguishes between "Education-based research" and "Research that meets the requirements of the international level" as though these fields were mutually exclusive. Under the latter heading, there is a clear effort to set out the justification for the concentration on research "not directly related to educational sciences" on the basis that this has helped the institution to win international recognition. There is a tacit recognition that the focus of the University's research agenda in the period under review has been skewed and there are some weak statements in relation to the areas of neglect (particularly in relation to study subject didactics) but no clear vision as to how the imbalance of recent years is to be redressed nor any clear strategic statements in relation to how the over-dependence on such instruments as the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) databases is to be compensated for in the future.
64. The SAR details a range of international research collaborations, particularly with institutions in Germany, Russia, Belarus, Poland and the United Kingdom. It is not clear why the University should be deeply engaged in a partnership with the Research Institute of

Theoretical Physics and Astronomy. This has led to publications in a range of physical and biological science disciplines. It is difficult for the Review Team to understand how such studies can be core to the mission of a University of Educational Sciences. Table 3.8 of the SAR makes it clear that these areas make little contribution to the growth of the numbers of doctoral students. Some 77% of the doctoral students are engaged in research in the field of Education Studies/Educology.

65. *It is recommended that the University examine its Strategy and Research Policy with a view to ensuring greater consistency between its mission and goals and its research outputs, especially with a view to improving research outputs in the educational sciences so that, as a specialised university with a focus on this particular field, it might redress the current imbalance in research output.*
66. Table 3.4 of the SAR and the accompanying text show a reasonably consistent output of research publications throughout the period under review (2005-2010) but it fails to distinguish between the output of researchers (those employed exclusively on research projects) and that of teachers. For this reason, it is impossible to assess the extent to which the work of the University's teachers is informed by or grounded in their research.
67. In 2005, the University had 542 FTE Staff. The corresponding number is now recorded as 432 (according to SAR: Introduction). The SAR makes the point that "one member of teaching or research staff on average publishes more than one and a half publications per year". However, the data actually show that output levels have been falling from 1.85 publications in 2005 to 1.62 in 2010.
68. *It is recommended that the publications and other measures of research conducted by teaching staff and research staff be presented separately in future reporting on research outputs in order that impact measures of research can be accurately assessed.*
69. The team also considered the **compliance of the research (and cycle 3 study programmes) with the priorities of national and/or regional economic, cultural and social development.**
70. The SAR presents the case that the University is entirely compliant with the national strategic goals set out in the "Resolution of the Parliament of the Republic of Lithuania re. Provisions of the National Education Strategy 2003-2012" (No. IX-1700, 4 July 2003)¹. However, this seventeen-page document contains only a single phrase referring to University education which sets out the aspiration that "more than 60% of Lithuanian youth acquire higher university or non-university education" (p. 16 of the Resolution). In 2003, the share of 30-34 year olds who had obtained tertiary or equivalent education was only 25.2%; by 2009, this figure had reached 40.6%². However, the SAR makes no reference here to this aspiration or to the extent to which the University has been committed to playing a role in achieving this national goal. There is no reference in this section to the University's support for measures to increase entry rates to higher education or to widening access to under-represented groups as set down in the Law on Research and Higher Education (2009). These are significant areas on which the review team would have expected LUES to comment..
71. While the Parliamentary Resolution cited above contains a number of other references to higher education, the main focus of the document is broadly on educational improvement and development, especially at other levels, from pre-school to adult education. The SAR details the manner in which the research of eleven of the University's doctoral students has addressed selected implementation measures of the National Education Strategy, 2003-2012. It also notes the extent to which the participation of University staff members in various conferences, both national and international, may have contributed to a better understanding

¹ <http://www.smm.lt/en/legislation/docs/Lithuanian%20Education%20Strategy%202003-2012.pdf>

² National Report on Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training ("ET 2020") accessed at http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc/natreport11/lithuania_en.pdf on 19 April 2012.

- or promotion of nine of these implementation measures. The SAR also indicates the other kinds of research that the University has engaged in and which link to national priorities. A particular focus relates to involvement in 357 art events (one-third of which were international) during the period 2005-2010.
72. The SAR notes that “since 2009, the University has started to run post-doctoral studies”. This is a welcome development on which the University is to be commended. Every effort should be made to increase the number involved.
 73. The SAR also indicates that there has been a considerable consistency both in the number of research contracts and in the number of associated events. It is clear that this kind of work and the surrounding activities and events contribute to the standing of the University both regionally and nationally.
 74. While the SAR notes that the cooperation with social partners helps to determine the research directions of the University, and the results of the research conducted at the University facilitate the development of the social partners’ activities, in the case of some contracts, it is not immediately apparent to the team how they contribute to the research focus of the institution (e.g. “Impact of the Policy of Tax and Social Security Contributions on Employment, Unemployment and Labour Market”). This also applies to the research contracts which the University won in the years 2005-2010, detailed in the SAR. While appreciating the need to accept contracts that are on offer, it is not obvious why research on certain of the topics should take place at a Pedagogical University, as the institution then was.
 75. As far as **harmonisation with the provisions of the European Research Area are concerned** the SAR identifies three ways in which the University seeks to bring itself into compliance. In summary, these are (a) by having University researchers apply to and participate in projects of the Sixth and Seventh Framework Programmes; (b) by engaging with the Bologna Process and most especially, post-2009, with a strong focus on doctoral programmes; (c) in an ongoing commitment to the Lisbon Strategy and its emphasis on building close collaboration between the University and partners in the world of work.
 76. The review team heard that staff members suggest areas of research which are matched to departmental priorities, and which are then fed upwards in the University to the Research Office. The Head of Department is responsible for discussing research areas with staff and as a rule they meet University strategic priorities. The team was told that it is in the University’s interests to ensure that research is effective and relevant but there was less clarity on how or where in the University relevance associated to regional/national needs was established. The Review Team suggests that the University might pay greater attention to the development of Personal Research Plans and Departmental Research Plans as part of the process of forging a clear institutional focus for its research mission.
 77. The SAR details the participation of faculty of the University in 19 European, 29 national and 16 other international projects, including FP6, FP7, NordPlus, Leonardo, Grundvig and Tempus projects. Taking the European projects together with the International ones, we find that 55% of all the projects through the period 2005 to 2010 were international. However, where nine out of ten were European projects in 2005, the figures show annual decreases until, in 2010, there were no new European projects listed on Table 3.13 (although it is difficult to reconcile the ‘0’ shown for 2010 with the preceding text). There has been significant growth in national projects with the consequence that now (2010) fewer than half of all projects are international.
 78. International mobility and impact of visiting researchers is comprehensively addressed in the SAR. It notes that there has been significant change over the period under study, indicating that in 2009 the number of study visits abroad was half the figure for 2007, while between 2006 and 2009 colleagues from foreign countries visiting the University were four times fewer. While the SAR offers a range of possible explanations (changing numbers of scientific events and mobility possibilities; economic crisis and reduced financial

opportunities), it seems clear that there is no single or immediately identifiable reason for this change.

79. One very positive indicator noted by the team is that while the overall number of mobility visits has fluctuated very considerably (from a high of 560 in 2007 to a low of 313 in 2009) the percentage of visits conducted for research purposes has remained remarkably resilient, normally comprising between 50% and 60% of all visits, and with 248 visits in 2010 still stands at this level (60%). Involvement in conferences is the major reason for outgoing mobility (accounting for 55% of all such travel). This same factor accounts for an even greater proportion of incoming traffic with 68% of all incoming researchers coming for the purpose of participating in conferences.
80. The SAR notes the contribution of incoming researchers both in relation to prestige and the exchange of good practice and the team also heard of examples from the staff and students that it met (see previous section).
81. Despite the wealth of examples given, little concrete evidence of the actual impact of all of this work on the Research and/or Art Activities of the University was evident to the team. For example, there is no documentation of how long term-partnerships have grown and become embedded in the work of the university, of the increased opportunities and profile provided to staff arising from such engagement, or most importantly, of the benefits accruing to the learning community and most especially to the student body from these activities.
82. ***The review team recommends that the University should conduct an impact analysis on the outcomes of the involvement of visiting researchers and artists on the University.***
83. In summary the University's strengths in this area include the establishment of post-doctoral studies at the University, the contribution which research contracts and associated events makes to the University's reputation, the consistency in the percentage of mobility visits carried out for research. Weaknesses identified by the team include low percentage of doctoral students, the skewing of the University's research base towards non-educational areas and the lack of a clear vision and strategy to address this, omissions in addressing some aspects of the National Education Strategy, the incomplete fit of all research contracts won by the University to the University's priorities, and lack of an assessment of the impact of mobility activities on research in the University,
84. **The team's judgement on the area Research and Art is a positive.**

VI. IMPACT ON REGIONAL AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

85. The review team explored the University's impact on regional and national development with reference to the criteria set out in the Methodology and considered the effectiveness and relevance of its contribution and impact on the economic, cultural, social and environmental development.
86. The SAR documents a wide variety of activities which it considers have an impact on regional and national development. As noted above, the team found that there are well established relationships with social partners and organisations. In some instances the relationships were long-lasting relationships, having been in existence for some 20 years, as with its association with the National Olympic Committee. Olympians are tested in sports laboratories of the university and academic staff and professors have assisted in designing high performance training. In return the Olympic Committee contributes financially and aids in acquiring equipment, giving scholarships and supporting the University's sportsmen and women in attending international conferences and seminars.
87. In section 4 of the SAR various indicators for impact are set out (e.g. for applied research, and popularisation of science) However, as has been indicated in other sections of this report, it was not obvious to the team how such indicators are regularly and strategically monitored in order that the University can assess the impact of its activities. The team

acknowledges that that there may be general difficulty in measuring impact, especially where information on activities may be qualitative rather than quantitative, but a sound tool for impact assessment is required.

88. ***The review team recommends that the University explores the use of a system which would enable it to measure more accurately and reliably the impact of its activities at national and regional level.***
89. The University's activities have a natural and automatic impact on national and regional priorities in that LUES produces some 75% of the country's teachers. The team heard of the impact that this had in the Vilnius region, including the fact that the Rector heads the municipality's public board of education. The impact of the University on the work of the Ministry of Education and Science was also noted. The recent move towards a longer period of teaching practice not only indicates an improvement for students in their study, but also is a measure of impact that the University's programmes are having in the world of work.
90. The team heard that there was a close relationship between the University and the Education Department of the Vilnius Municipality. The relationship reflects the fact that in Vilnius there are over 280 educational institutions at different levels. The cooperation is two-way: students from the University are accepted for teaching practice in the various institutions, and the municipality also employs graduates as teachers. The University is also important in providing continuing professional development area for staff in Vilnius schools who can achieve further qualifications through the programmes of the Professional Competence Institute.
91. The team heard that, while the University focussed on links with Vilnius schools, the geographical coverage is broader than this. The team heard that the Careers Department has a joint agreement with 19 schools in Vilnius but it also covers schools all over Lithuania and has agreements with educational departments in other districts. The team expected that, given its specific field of education, the University could have an impact in helping remote schools (which might not have connections with educational organisations or partners) to improve their teaching. The team heard that the University tries to send out students to different districts and schools so that they can familiarise themselves with a diversity of situations. However, the problem of how to communicate with and support the student then arises. The University has tried to deal with this by collecting feedback from all schools and trying to visit the schools as well. While the team notes these links, it did not hear of any strategy approach to linking up with specific schools, nor of assessment of the impact that the links were having.
92. The team heard that various members of the University had produced school textbooks and that teachers must have prepared at least one teaching aid to successfully pass the Attestation committee. While such publications are not eligible to be included in assessment of research they nevertheless contribute to the development of society at large. During its visit to a teaching classroom the team saw examples of textbooks authored by University staff and recognise as good practice the integrated and thematic nature of the teaching books for primary education written by LUE staff.
93. The team heard from students that information in support of students with special needs was embedded in the curriculum of some programmes and could include a teaching practice in a special needs school. The team also saw copies of contracts with organisations which provide services in the area of special needs to the University.
94. The Team noted that the University has set up a website (www.zaliasis.vpu.lt) which advocates the activities of the University as green university.
95. With respect to applied research the team heard about the impact that sports science in the University had had on the preparation of Olympic athletes, and saw the facilities within the University which were being used for this activity. The team was mindful that much of the research of the university, being in educational research, is applied to the needs of society (see section V).

96. The compliance of the research activities (and cycle 3 study programmes) with the priorities of national and/or regional economic, cultural and social development were discussed in the previous section and it was concluded there that the University had room to improve in this area. It seems to the team that as far as student research projects were concerned, it was sometimes a matter of coincidence whether such projects were chosen for their impact on regional or national priorities, since students largely seemed to choose the projects themselves or in conjunction with specific professors, rather than there being a strategic direction. Similarly, it seemed to the team that research staff try to address regional and national needs, but again there is no explicit strategic direction behind this (see the recommendation in paragraph 65 of Section V).
97. The SAR outlines the activities of staff in voluntary service activities. The team heard of an example of this in its meeting with social partners when it was noted that university staff voluntarily give lectures to the University of the Third Age.
98. In summary the University's strengths in this area include the longstanding partnership with the National Olympic Committee, the impact on educational services in the district of Vilnius, the integrated and thematic nature of the textbooks produced by some staff members, and the embedding of special needs in some curricula. Weaknesses identified by the team include the lack of evaluation of indicators to assess the impact of the University at national and regional level, and the lack of a strategic approach for linking with remote schools or analysing the impact that links are having.
99. **The team's judgement on the area Impact on Regional and National Development is a positive.**

VII. BEST PRACTICE EXAMPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The team considers the following to be examples of best practice:

- The increase in the teaching practice period and the credit increase to 30 ECTS (see paragraph 23)
- The revision and updating of all study programmes (see paragraph 23, 46)
- Students are represented on all major committees and they have influence; students expressed no problems with decision-making and felt that their voice is heard (see paragraph 27, 49)
- The close and longstanding relationships of the University with its social partners (see paragraph 52, 86, 90)
- The integrated thematic teaching books for primary education written by LUES staff (see paragraph 92).

The following is a summary of the team's recommendations:

- The team recommends that it would be beneficial for the University to develop further its capacity for effective self-analysis. (paragraph 4)
- The review team recommends that the University quickly finalises its strategy for quality assurance in order to ensure consistent operation of quality assurance mechanisms across the University, paying due regard to European Standards and Guidelines. (paragraph 22)
- The review team recommends that without delay the University ensures that arrangements are made so that appropriate external scrutiny is applied to the decisions of its major decision-making bodies. (paragraph 38)

- The review team recommends that the University ensures that its new Strategic Plan is approved without delay and that particular attention is paid to ensuring coherent mechanisms are in place for implementation and monitoring of the Plan. (paragraph 41)
- The team recommends that learning outcomes should be linked to the level descriptors of the European Qualifications Framework and that there should be consistent use learning outcomes in the operation and assessment of programmes; learning outcomes should be more actively implemented. This may necessitate in depth consideration of learning and teaching methods to ensure that learning outcomes are delivered. (paragraph 51)
- It is recommended that the University examine its Strategy and Research Policy with a view to ensuring greater consistency between its mission and goals and its research outputs, especially with a view to improving research outputs in the educational sciences so that, as a specialised university with a focus on this particular field, it might redress the current imbalance in research output. (paragraph 65)
- It is recommended that the publications and other measures of research conducted by teaching staff and research staff be presented separately in future reporting on research outputs in order that impact measures of research can be accurately assessed. (paragraph 68)
- The review team recommends that the University should conduct an impact analysis on the outcomes of the involvement of visiting researchers and artists on the University. (paragraph 82)
- The review team recommends that the University explores the use of a system which would enable it to measure more accurately and reliably the impact of its activities at national and regional level. (paragraph 88)

VIII. JUDGEMENT

Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences is given **negative** evaluation

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Brian O'Connor
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Jacques Lanares Prof. Peadar Cremin Bastian Baumann Virginija Rupainienė Gintarė Alaburdaitė
Vertinimo sekretorius: Review secretary:	Dr Gillian King

ANNEX. RESPONSE TO REVIEW REPORT

RESPONSE TO REVIEW REPORT OF LITHUANIAN UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

We express our gratitude for the valuable remarks and recommendations. Following Article 47 of “Methodology for Conducting an Institutional Review in Higher Education”, hereby we present our comments on several factual errors, which, in our opinion, occurred in the preliminary review conclusions.

III. STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

Hereby provided is a comment, not criticism, on one of the factual errors.

In response to Comment and Recommendation 41 of the Review Report Draft (p. 15), we would like to note that the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania passed Law No. XI-1987 on Amendments of the Law on Higher Education and Research on 24 April 2012 (Official Gazette, 2012, No. 53-2639) and it came into effect on 8 May 2012. Its provisions (Art. 24 ‘Application of the Law’) establish that prior to the organization and consolidation of the councils of state schools of higher education (which shall be completed by 31 December 2012), the Senate (Academic Council) performs the functions of the Council, provided for in Article 20 Section 2 of the Law on Higher Education and Research, namely it can approve the strategic plan. With this reference, Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences approved its strategic plan for 2012-2020 on 30 May 2012. The summary was made available in English for the review team.

The new Council, as provided for in the amended Law on Higher Education and Research, will be established by 31 December 2012. Following Article No. 24 of the afore-said Law, currently the functions of the Council are performed by the Senate. It is also noteworthy that under the Law greater part of the functions, formerly assigned to the councils of all universities in general, has been cancelled.

IV. ACADEMIC STUDIES AND LIFE-LONG LEARNING

We would like to give you some clarification of certain points concerning University outgoing students who participate in exchange programmes (Comment No. 48, Recommendation p. 16).

The major exchange programme the students of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences are involved in is the EU Lifelong Learning Programme (Erasmus). It is sponsored by the European Commission and the national government. This program is administered following the rules and regulations of administration introduced by the National Agency (*Švietimo mainų paramos fondas*) available from <http://www.smpf.lt/lt/programos/erasmus> and Rules for Participation in Erasmus Exchange Programme for Students of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences approved by Rector’s Order available from University website at <http://www.vpu.lt/trs/Page.aspx?pageID=3735> (*Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto studentų LLP/Erasmus studijų mobilumo programos atrankos taisyklės*) in Lithuanian (for translation see *Appendix 1. Rules for Participation in Erasmus Exchange Programme for Students of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences*).

According to the *Rules for Participation in Erasmus Exchange Programme for Students of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences*, students have to sign Learning Agreement (see *Appendix 2*) before going abroad on Erasmus exchange programme in which they have to provide a list of subjects they are going to study at the host university. This list is reviewed and

approved by the Departmental Coordinator and Institutional Coordinator. Departmental Coordinator (who usually is Deputy Dean of the faculty) is responsible for the approval of the study programme before students leave for the host university (see Article No. 23 of the *Rules for Participation in Erasmus Exchange Programme for Students of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences*: “23. Erasmus studies programme and Learning Agreement are regulated according to the following procedure:

23.1. A nominee chooses the subjects from a list offered by host institution. The chosen programme should match with the study programme in Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences. At least 30 ECTS credits should be accumulated during one semester.

23.2. The chosen list of subjects should be approved by Departmental Coordinator and Erasmus Institutional Coordinator.”).

Therefore, we cannot agree with the statement in Comment No. 47 of Preliminary Conclusions of the Institutional Review Report of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences that “*exchange programmes appropriate to a student’s study are not always agreed beforehand, leading to a student needing to make up courses when he/she returns to the University*”. There are some cases, however, when students need to make up courses when they return to the University. However, the reasons behind that are students’ failure to pass exams of the chosen courses in the host university, cancellation of the courses of their choice by the host university and lack of students’ responsibility to make changes to the original Learning Agreement in due course although their responsibility is clearly defined in *Rules for Participation in Erasmus Exchange Programme for Students of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences* (see Article No. 54: “Students going on Erasmus studies must ensure that any changes in the Learning Agreement are immediately approved by Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences and the host university in writing”). No credit might be awarded for the overseas studies only in case students make changes to the original Learning Agreement without it being approved by Departmental Coordinator and Institutional Coordinator. If students return to University with the Learning Agreement fulfilled they are awarded full accreditation (see Articles No. 30, 31 and 32 of *The Rules for Participation in Erasmus Exchange Programme for Students of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences*: “30. Study period in host institution and received marks/credits are accredited according to all requirements of Erasmus study programme referring to academic achievement accreditation document of the faculty (Supplement No. 4) (for the Academic Achievement Accreditation Document see *Appendix 3*).

31. Studies abroad can be unaccredited only if study results do not meet the minimal requirements of host institution. Then a student is allowed to eliminate academic debt according to determinate procedure.

32. If there are subjects that a student has not attended due to *force major* such as changes in host institution, a student is allowed to attend these courses and to accumulate deficient amount of credits in his/her home university”).

As for Comment No. 55 of the preliminary conclusions of the Institutional Review Report of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences “*The team heard from students of some of the barriers to taking up an exchange place. A major barrier is the likelihood of having to give up a job in Lithuania with no guarantee of another on the student’s return. Language problems also inhibit exchanges. The cost of travel is also a barrier. The team suggests that the University consider ways to overcome these barriers which might include seeking partner universities which could provide cost effective exchange places for students, and the provision of language learning in the University, for incoming as well as outgoing students*”, we can point out that Erasmus exchange students are provided with financial support (see Articles No. 41 and 42 of *Rules for Participation in Erasmus Exchange Programme for Students of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences*: “41. The Erasmus scholarships are awarded in order to cover the additional mobility programme costs, i.e., travel and insurance expenses;

learning, if there is a need, of a foreign language; compensation for larger living costs in the hosting country. The scholarships are not meant to compensate all the expenses of studying abroad.

42. The sizes of the Erasmus scholarships are approved by the Rector's Order for each academic year in accordance with the guidelines for the administration and fund management for student and staff mobility for education institutions of the Erasmus mobility subprogramme of the European Union Lifelong Learning Programme." Therefore, students of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences receive scholarships which cover travel expenses, accommodation costs, etc.) and their size is in accordance with the guidelines for the administration and fund management for student and staff mobility for education institutions of the Erasmus mobility subprogramme of the European Union Lifelong Learning Program. The regulations of Erasmus programme are valid for all participants; therefore students of all universities participating in Erasmus exchange programme enjoy the same rights and advantages.

V. RESEARCH AND ART

In response to Comment No. 58 which states that "During the period under review, doctoral students have been enrolled in the areas of Biology, Education, History, Philology, Physics and Psychology. In 2011, 1906 bachelors and 246 masters graduated from the University, and 17 doctoral students successfully defended their theses. This indicates **that of 2169 graduates, fewer than 1% (0.78%) are graduating at PhD level**", we hold the opinion that the ratio of PhD graduates should be calculated not in relation to the total number of graduates in 2011, but rather the number of graduates of the second cycle, since the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania allocates state-funded positions for doctoral studies in regard with the number of Master (second cycle) graduates of a particular study field. According to the order of the allotment of positions for doctoral studies at a particular study field in Lithuania, the number of allotted positions for doctoral studies is proportional to the number of Master (second cycle) graduates in the same study field and area in the running year. Therefore, in order to calculate the percentage of the graduates in the area of Education (Social Sciences), not the total number of graduates (2169) from LUES in 2011, but rather the number of Master graduates in the field of Social Sciences should be considered: 117 masters of Social Sciences graduated from the University in 2011. Consequently, the percentage of PhD graduates in the field of Social Sciences (12 doctoral students defended their theses in 2011) would make 10.25 per cent in relation to the number of master graduates.

Even if we calculated the number of PhD graduates in relation to the total number (246) of master graduates of *all* study fields in 2011, the percentage of PhD graduates would constitute 6.9 per cent rather than 0.78 per cent.

We would like to note that the assumption of Comment No. 60 stating that "Chapter 3 of the SAR identifies the four issues on which there was a focus during the period 2005-2010. Three of them might be expected in the context of a University of Educational Sciences. However, the fourth refers to prioritising the "development of applied science research" without making any reference to the specific area of educational sciences. The SAR also has a statement in regard to the mission of the University which may also be interpreted as prioritising scientific knowledge, in general, over educational science" can be regarded only as an interpretation, since it does not comply with the reality.

Comment No. 62 of the Preliminary Conclusions of the Institutional Review Report of Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences states that "the SAR also distinguishes between "Education-based research" and "Research that meets the requirements of the international

level” as though these fields were mutually exclusive. Under the latter heading, there is a clear effort to set out the justification for the concentration on research “not directly related to educational sciences” on the basis that this has helped the institution to win international recognition. There is a **tacit recognition** in the SAR **that the focus of the University’s research agenda in the period under review has been skewed** and there are some weak statements in relation to the areas of neglect (particularly in relation to study subject didactics) but no clear vision as to how the imbalance of recent years is to be redressed nor any clear strategic statements in relation to how the over-dependence on such instruments as the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) databases is to be compensated for in the future.” In response to remarks provided for in Clause No. 62, we would like to emphasise the fact that according to the teacher training model approved in this country, the graduates of the University are conferred not only degrees in the study field of Education Studies (Social Sciences) but also qualification degrees of Bachelor in other research areas and fields as well as teacher’s professional qualification of the respective subject. Therefore, the University employs not only researchers in Education sciences but also those in other research areas – chemists, biologists, historians, philologists etc., who teach a particular subject but not subject didactics and, simultaneously, carry out research work related to a particular research area, field and branch but not necessarily to subject didactics. If such university teachers and research were rejected, the University would be deprived of the right to confer any qualification degrees since the studies would fail to meet any established requirements. Therefore, assignment of priority not only to Educational sciences is logical and understandable. Thus, the focus of the University’s research agenda did not skew but, on the opposite, was purposefully implemented. Foreseeing the scope and priorities of scientific research conducted in the University, the concept of the university as an institution, which trains highly qualified specialists in social and fundamental sciences, served as basis.

Comment No. 64 that *“it is recommended that the University examine its Strategy and Research Policy with a view to ensuring greater consistency between its mission and goals and its research outputs, especially with a view to improving research outputs in the educational sciences so that, LUES as a specialised university with a focus on this particular field, it might redress the current imbalance in research output”* has already been considered: the Strategy and Research Policy have been reviewed and are provided in the new Strategic Plan of the University.

As for Comment No. 65 on the lack of clearly distinguished data on scientific publication output between researchers (those employed exclusively on research projects), which resulted in failure “to assess the extent to which the work of the University’s teachers is informed by or grounded in their research“, we regret to state that there are no researchers in the University, who are employed **exclusively** on research projects.

We agree with the statement in Comment No. 66 that research publication “output levels have been falling from 1.85 publications in 2005 to 1.62 in 2010”; however, we would like to note that the University succeeded in meeting the provision that “one member of teaching or research staff on average publishes more than one and a half publications per year” due to a decrease in the number of academic and research staff from 542 to 432 employees in 2005–2010.

VI. IMPACT ON REGIONAL AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The preliminary conclusions of the Review Report state that “Weaknesses identified by the team include (...) the fewer associations which the University has with schools outside Vilnius”. It should be pointed out that this conclusion is not valid. The statistical data on the

institutions for teaching practice (institutions that accept students for teaching practice) from 2005 to 2010 show that such institutions in Vilnius region accounted for 42-50 per cent of the total number of the institutions selected for teaching practice (on the basis of trilateral agreements). Schools in other regions of Lithuania made up from 49 to 57 per cent of the total number of the institutions for practice (see: the table below).

Numbers of institutions where University students have their teaching practice

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Total number of institutions	463	601	440	477	429	486*
Among them, in Vilnius region	215	285	202	210	183	245
Schools in other regions (%)	53.57 %	52.75 %	54.10 %	55.98 %	57.35 %	49.59 %
Schools in Vilnius region (%)	46.43 %	47.25 %	45.90 %	44.02 %	42.65 %	50.41 %

Vilnius 4 June 2012



Rector Algirdas Gaižutis

* The numbers were revised after the self-assessment review