

APPROVED  
by Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 of the  
Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in  
Higher Education

## **METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAMMES**

### **I GENERAL PROVISIONS**

1. The Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes (hereinafter referred to as 'the Methodology') shall regulate external study programme evaluation organised by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as 'the Centre') in respect of their participants, procedures, evaluation areas, criteria, general requirements for study programme self-evaluation reports (hereinafter referred to as 'self-evaluation reports'), study programme analysis, expert team work organisation, ethical principles and appeals procedures.

2. The Methodology has been developed in the implementation process of the Procedure for the External Evaluation and Accreditation of Study Programmes approved by Order No ISAK-1652 of 24 July 2009 of the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania (Official Gazette, 2009, No 96-4083) (hereinafter referred to as 'the Evaluation and Accreditation Procedure') in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area and other legal acts governing the provision and evaluation of study programmes.

3. For the purposes of this Methodology:

3.1. Stakeholders shall mean persons, groups of persons or organisations concerned with and capable of affecting the activities of a higher education institution and assuming responsibility for such influence (administrative and academic staff of the institution, students, their parents, alumni, employers, representatives of professional associations and trade unions, public institutions, etc.);

3.2. Evaluation coordinator shall mean an employee of the Centre responsible for the organisation of the evaluation of a specific study programme.

3.3. The other concepts used in the Methodology correspond to the concepts defined in the Law on Science and Studies of the Republic of Lithuania, Description of the Procedure of Assessment and Accreditation of the Republic of Lithuania and other legal acts specifying general and special requirements for study programmes.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

### **II EVALUATION OF STUDY PROGRAMMES**

#### **I. PARTICIPANTS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

4. The main participants of the evaluation process shall include:

4.1. the higher education institution whose study programme is being evaluated;

4.2. the Centre;

4.3. other persons invited by the Centre to help with the evaluation;

4.3.1. the expert team performing the evaluation including team leader;

4.3.2. the Studies' Evaluation Committee (hereinafter referred to as 'the Committee') acting in accordance with its regulations approved by the Director of the Centre's order. The Committee shall review the reports made by the expert team and advise the Centre regarding the objectivity, validity and comprehensiveness of the report of the expert team.

5. It shall be the usual practice to form an expert team for the evaluation of several programmes in the same study field.

6. The evaluation process shall consist of the following stages:

6.1. planning of the evaluation;

6.2. application to the Centre for the evaluation;

6.3. self-evaluation and the production of the self-evaluation report;

6.4. preparations for the evaluation;

6.5. visit of the expert team at the higher education institution (hereinafter referred to as 'the visit');

6.6. production of the evaluation report by the expert team;

6.7. discussions of the evaluation report by the Committee;

6.8. adoption of the decision concerning assessment and public announcement of the decision and assessment conclusions;

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

6.9. follow-up activities.

7. The key stages in the evaluation process shall include self-evaluation, the visit, preparation of evaluation report (preparation of the evaluation report, its discussion and publication) and the follow-up activities.

8. The key actors of the planning process shall include the Centre and the higher education institution. The expert team shall not be involved at this stage.

9. The key actor at the self-evaluation stage shall be the higher education institution. The Centre shall be involved only as an adviser on the performance of self-evaluation and the submission of the self-evaluation report. The expert team may affect the self-evaluation process only by proposing improvements on the Methodology.

10. The key actors at the preparation stage shall be the Centre and the expert team it sets up. The higher education institution may make motivated proposals for replacing one or another member of the expert team.

11. During the visit stage, the evaluation coordinator appointed by the Centre shall act as a facilitator in setting the visit date and observing adherence to the schedule of the visit.

12. The key actor in the production of the evaluation report shall be the expert team. The higher education institution may only provide comments on the factual errors in the expert team's draft report. The role of the Centre at this stage shall be to ensure a timely provision of the expert team's draft report to the higher education institution and a timely provision of the institution's comments on the factual mistakes in the report (if any) to the expert team.

13. For purposes of the examination of findings the Centre shall engage Studies' Evaluation Committee.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

14. The key actor at the follow-up stage shall be the higher education institution tasked with improving the study programme with regard to the weaknesses found during the self-evaluation and in the evaluation report.

## II. EVALUATION PROCESS

15. A higher education school that wishes to have the programme assessment to be performed by the Centre should send the request to have the study programme(s) assessed and accredited to the Centre by email [kokybe@skvc.lt](mailto:kokybe@skvc.lt) eighteen months prior to the deadline of the accreditation of the programme. The Centre shall publicly announce the list of study fields intended to be assessed, deadlines for submission of self-analysis reports and type of assessment, specifying the field of programmes to be assessed by Lithuanian expert groups and those to be assessed by international expert groups.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

16. If necessary, the Centre shall advise the higher education institution on issues related to self-

evaluation.

17. The higher education institution shall be responsible for the proper conduct of its self-evaluation and the timely production of the self-evaluation report.

18. The higher education institution shall conduct its self-evaluation according to the procedure established by themselves. The self-evaluation report must meet the requirements set in this Methodology.

19. The self-evaluation process may include the following recommended stages:

19.1. make up and, pursuant to the order of the principle of the higher education school or head of its division, appoint a self-analysis performance and development group (hereinafter referred to as the self-analysis group) which will perform an internal assessment (self-analysis) of the programme or several programmes of one field;

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

19.2. defining the tasks and responsibilities of each member of the group;

19.3. drawing up the schedule of the group's activities;

19.4. collecting data for self-evaluation;

19.5. analysing the data;

19.6. discussing the results of the self-evaluation performed; and

19.7. producing a self-evaluation report.

20. The self-evaluation group should include active, experienced and competent representatives of the administrative and teaching staff, students and other stakeholders. It is recommended that the self-evaluation group should consist of no more than seven members. In case the higher education institution is conducting self-evaluation of several study programmes within a certain study field, it is possible to set up subgroups. The activities of the subgroups shall be coordinated by a person appointed from among the self-evaluation group members.

21. After its completion, the results of the self-evaluation must be discussed with the community of the institution or one of its units. The discussion should be attended by as many members of the community as possible, including students.

22. The self-evaluation group shall produce a self-evaluation report by taking into account the observations and comments offered during the discussions.

23. The higher education institution shall submit its self-evaluation report to the Centre by the deadline set by the Centre.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

24. The assessment in the Centre will begin only after receiving all the documents specified in Paragraphs 15 and 23.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

25. The Centre may refuse to carry out the evaluation if:

25.1. the higher education institution fails to submit an application for the evaluation of a study programme by the deadline referred to in Point 15 of the Methodology;

25.2. the higher education institution fails to submit a self-evaluation report by the deadline referred to in Point 23 of the Methodology.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

26. Two weeks before the visit of the experts at the latest, the higher education institution may submit information on the essential changes in the study programme introduced after the submission of the self-evaluation report to the Centre.

27. The Centre shall verify the self-evaluation report for compliance with the requirements of the Methodology and shall notify the higher education institution of the necessary amendments within 20 days of the self-evaluation report receipt.

28. The higher education institution shall submit the amended self-evaluation report within 20 days of the receipt of the Centre's notification of its irregularities.

29. Study programme evaluation may be carried out by Lithuanian or international expert teams.

30. Expert selection shall be conducted according to the Expert Selection Procedure approved by the Director of the Centre (hereinafter referred to as 'the Expert Selection Procedure').

31. The Centre shall notify the higher education school about the composition of the expert group by fax or email. The higher education school shall, within five working days following the date when the notification about the intended composition of the expert group was sent, may provide arguments about the change of the intended member(s) of the expert group. The Centre shall consider the comments received and shall notify the higher education school about the decision taken accordingly. In the event where the higher education school fails to make a proposal concerning the change of the composition of the expert group, it shall be deemed that the higher education school has approved the composition of the expert group.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

32. The Centre shall organise a meeting of the expert team to help the experts understand the aims and objectives of the evaluation, to explain the Methodology and to introduce other legal acts governing external evaluation of study programmes.

33. The Centre shall make the self-evaluation report available to the experts at least one month before their visit at the higher education institution. In cases when, for reasons beyond reasonable control of the Centre, some of the experts on the team change, and it is objectively impossible to make the said information available to the new members within the time limit set in this point, the self-evaluation report shall be produced immediately after the new experts are included on the expert team.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

34. After their analysis of the information contained in the self-evaluation report, the experts shall draw up preliminary report and define the areas and issues requiring special attention during the visit. The Centre shall draw up the visit schedule and coordinate it with the higher education institution, which makes the data and the schedule of the visit publicly available.

35. The duration of the expert group visit to the higher education school is between 1 and 5 days.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

36. During the visit, the expert team shall meet the administration staff of the institution or its relevant unit, the self-evaluation group, the teaching staff, students, graduates and their employers. A visit shall be deemed effective when at least 2/3 of the expert team members attend the visit. During the visit, the experts shall have access to the learning resources of the study programme, students' term papers and final thesis, examination material and other documents.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

37. The higher education institution shall ensure that any member of its community wishing to meet the expert team can have an opportunity to do so.

38. The higher education institution shall ensure that the expert team has the appropriate premises and equipment necessary for its work and meetings.

39. During one visit, a member of the institution's community may participate only at one meeting with the expert team, except for cases agreed separately and in advance with a representative of the Centre.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

40. Meetings with graduates and employers may not be attended by persons who study and/or are employed at the higher education institution.

41. Where the evaluation is conducted by a team of international experts, the working language of the meetings shall normally be English. If necessary, the higher education institution may procure services of

quality interpretation. During meetings with students an interpreter may only attend if agreed with the evaluation coordinator.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

42. At the end of the visit, the expert team shall hold a discussion of the outcomes of the visit within the team and make an oral presentation of its preliminary conclusions to the community of the higher education institution.

43. The expert group shall develop draft conclusions and send them by email to the Centre usually not later than within one month following the end of the visit to the higher education school. The draft conclusions shall not indicate the assessment of the programme and assessment fields in scores. The Centre shall review the draft conclusions and forward it to the higher education school.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

44. The higher education institution may submit to the Centre its comments on what the institution considers to be factual errors in the draft report within 14 days of the draft report's dispatch date. Comments with regards to factual errors shall be made in the Lithuanian language accompanied by a translation into the English language where evaluation was done by an international expert team. In all other cases comments shall be made in the Lithuanian language only.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

45. The Centre shall forward the institution's comments on what it considers to be factual errors in the draft report to the expert team.

46. The experts shall take account of the institution's comments on what the higher education institution considers to be factual errors in the draft report and shall, within 14 days, produce and submit an evaluation report to the Centre.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

47. For purposes of the examination of findings the Centre shall engage Studies' Evaluation Committee. The expert team leader, or some other member of the expert team, shall present the team's findings in the evaluation report during the meeting of the said Committee. Absence of the expert team leader, or some other member of the expert team, shall not preclude the Committee from examining the report. Representatives of the higher education institution may be involved in this stage of evaluation as needed.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

48. Where the self-evaluation group and other representatives of the higher education institution are invited to the meeting, they shall be sent documents to be examined at the meeting.

49. Having examined the evaluation report and the arguments presented by the attendees of the meeting, the Committee shall decide on one of the judgements provided in the Committee's Regulations.

50. Pursuant to the expert opinion and following the proposal of the Study Assessment Commission the Centre shall, in compliance with the procedure laid down in the Description of the Procedure of Assessment and Accreditation, make a decision concerning the assessment of the programme. Together with the decision, the Centre shall send by email assessment conclusions or a copy thereof or a statement of the assessment conclusions to the higher education school.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

51. The Centre and the higher education institution shall make the evaluation report publicly available.

52. Responsibility for the follow-up activities shall usually be vested in the higher education institution unless specified otherwise in other legal acts.

53. The higher education institution shall define measures for the elimination of its weaknesses identified in the self-evaluation process and the improvement of the study programme. Information on the measures shall be made accessible to the academic community of the institution.

54. The higher education institution may apply to the Centre for the evaluation of its ongoing/intended action plan for the improvement of the quality of studies.

55. In organising a study programme evaluation, the Centre shall undertake to examine the way the study programme providers have acted on the weaknesses found in the latest evaluation and the way they have implemented proposals for the improvement of the programme.

### III. EVALUATION AREAS AND CRITERIA

56. A study programme evaluation shall involve examination of 6 areas: the aims and learning outcomes of the study programme, curriculum design, teaching staff, facilities and learning resources, study process and students' performance assessment and programme management.

57. Each evaluation area shall be analysed according to the established criteria, i.e. on the basis of evidence pointing to the quality of the studies.

58. The programme objective(s) and intended fields of learning outcomes shall be assessed in accordance with the following criteria:

58.1. programme objective(s) and intended learning outcomes are well-defined, clear and publicly announced;

58.2. programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the state, societal and labour market needs;

58.3. programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission, operational objectives and/or strategy of the higher education school;

58.4. programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked on academic and/or professional requirements;

58.5. programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the type and cycle of studies and the level of qualifications;

58.6. the title of the programme, intended learning outcomes, the content of the programme and the qualification to be obtained are well-tuned.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

59. The field of the programme structure shall be assessed in accordance with the following criteria:

59.1. the programme structure is in line with the legislative requirements;

59.2. subjects of study (modules) are taught in a consistent matter, subjects or topics are not repeated;

59.3. the content of subjects (modules) corresponds to the type and cycle of studies;

59.4. the content of subjects (modules) and study methods enable to achieve the intended learning outcomes;

59.5. the scope of the programme is sufficient to achieve the learning outcomes;

59.6. the content of the programme corresponds to the latest academic, artistic or technological achievements.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

60. The teaching staff shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:

60.1. the study programme is provided by the staff meeting legal requirements;

60.2. the qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes;

60.3. the number of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure learning outcomes;

60.4. teaching staff turnover is able to ensure an adequate provision of the programme;

60.5. the higher education school shall ensure (offer) conditions for professional (subject-matter,

pedagogical, personal) upgrading of staff necessary to implement the programme;

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

60.6. the higher education school shall conduct academic research (applied scientific research, artistic activities) that are directly related to the programme analysed.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

61. Facilities and learning resources shall be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- 61.1. the premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality;
- 61.2. the teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are adequate both in size and quality;
- 61.3. the higher education institution has adequate arrangements for students' practice;
- 61.4. teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible.

62. The process of studies and assessment thereof shall be carried out in accordance with the following criteria:

- 62.1. entrance requirements are well-founded, consistent and transparent;
- 62.2. organisation of the study process ensures proper implementation of the programme and achievement of the intended learning outcomes;
- 62.3. students are encouraged to take part in scientific, artistic or applied science activities;
- 62.4. students are provided conditions to take part in mobility programmes;
- 62.5. the higher education school ensures proper academic and social support;
- 62.6. the system of assessing student achievements is clear, public and appropriate to assess the learning outcomes;
- 62.7. professional activities of the majority of programme graduates correspond to the expectations of programme executors and employers;
- 62.8. the programme corresponds to the state economic, social and cultural and future development needs;
- 62.9. fair learning environment is ensured;
- 62.10. students are provided opportunities to make complaints and lodge appeals in accordance with clear, public and transparent procedures.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

63. Programme management should be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- 63.1. responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated;
- 63.2. periodic collection, analysis and usage of data and other information about the implementation of the programme;

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

63.3. the outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme;

- 63.4. the evaluation and improvement processes involve stakeholders;
- 63.5. the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient;
- 63.6. the information about the study programme is public, relevant and easily accessible.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

### III. PRODUCTION OF A SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

## I. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

64. Higher education institutions shall conduct self-evaluation according to the procedures defined by themselves with due regard to the objectives of the self-evaluation.

65. The self-evaluation report should demonstrate the institution's capacity for analysis, critical evaluation of its own work and for projection of prospects for improvement.

66. Statements in the self-evaluation report should be supported by quantitative and qualitative evidence.

67. The self-evaluation report should present information necessary for evaluation in a succinct manner and the self-evaluation group should be careful not to make the report too long. The recommended scope of the self-evaluation report should not exceed 30 pages (excluding annexes).

68. Self-evaluation shall be conducted according to each criterion specified in the Methodology. In case a certain criterion is not applicable to the study programme, the fact should be duly recorded in the self-evaluation report.

69. Compliance with the criteria specified in the Methodology shall be analysed in the context of the quality of the entire programme: compliance with a certain criterion shall be analysed and judged by taking into consideration its effect on the entire programme.

70. Examination of any area shall include analysis of the changes stimulated by the latest evaluation of the programme.

71. At the end of the analysis carried out in every field, the strengths and weaknesses of the programme in the field shall be specified, actions for improvement and deadlines for making such actions shall be envisaged for each field.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

72. If the evaluation of the programme is conducted by an international expert team, the self-evaluation report shall be submitted in English.

73. The higher education school shall submit to the Centre the following:

73.1. a request to assess and accredit the programme;

73.2. an electronic copy of self-analysis report (saved on a computer medium or sent by email to kokybe@skvc.lt) in Lithuanian and/or English (if an international expert group is to perform the assessment).

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

74. The self-evaluation report shall cover data of the past 5 academic years. In case the programme has been provided for a shorter period of time, the report should cover data of the entire period.

75. Self-analysis report shall be submitted for every programme individually. If a programme of the same field is carried out by the branch of a higher education school that is located in another town, a separate self-analysis report of the programme carried out in the division shall always be developed. If the programme includes specialisations, they should be described in one self-analysis report but one specialisation shall be examined separately. If the programme or a part of it is carried out in a division that is not part of a higher education school and that is located in another municipality, the self-analysis report should also include analysis of the programme implementation in that location indicating the special features related to it.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

76. In case a study programme is provided as a full-time and part-time programme, each mode shall be examined separately. The mode of studies which is analysed first shall be presented in full while the analysis of the other mode shall present information common to both modes of studies only through references to the description of the mode of studies analysed first.

77. Revoke the validity of Point 77 of Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes approved by Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 on the approval of Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes.

*Amendments to the clause:*



78. In case the programme is a joint study programme (i.e. it has been developed and provided together with another/other higher education institution(s)), the self-evaluation report shall clearly separate the parts of the programme provided by each institution and their learning resources (equipment, teaching materials and human resources) used for the provision of their part of the programme.

79. Electronic versions of self-analysis reports of the same field in a higher education school shall be submitted to the Centre in one computer medium or sent by email. The general part of the self-analysis report should be presented as a DOC or PDF file. The self-analysis report with annexes should be archived in a WinZip or WinRar format. The folder name should state the name of the higher education school (its acronym), programme name (a shortened version if its name is longer than three words) in Lithuanian or in English if the assessment is carried out by an international expert group. Folder names should not use Lithuanian characters. Each annex to the self-analysis report should be presented as a separate file. Annexes presented as individual documents should be put into one folder. Names of individual annexes should correspond to the content of the annex.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Žin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

80. The first page of the self-evaluation report shall contain the name of the higher education institution conducting the self-evaluation, its logo, the study field, the year of the self-evaluation report and the title of the study programme. The lower part of the page shall contain the personal details (title, first and last names) and the signatures of the head of the higher education institution and the leader of the self-evaluation team.

81. The bottom of the first page shall carry the venue, year and month of the self-evaluation report.

82. The second page of the report shall contain the title of the study programme, its national code, higher education type (college or university), level (first, second) or type (in cases of integrated studies), mode (full-time or part-time), duration in years, the scope of the programme in credits, qualifications awarded and the registration date of the study programme. It may also contain certain additional information such as the start of the programme provision, the language of instruction and other details.

83. The lower part of the second page shall contain personal details of the self-evaluation group members: academic rank, scientific degree, first and last name, position at the higher education institution, telephone numbers (office, mobile) and e-mail address, which will be necessary while organising the visit or clarifying issues relating to the self-evaluation report.

84. The self-evaluation report shall consist of the following parts: introduction, analysis of the programme, annexes.

85. The introduction should contain the following:

85.1. a brief description of the organisational structure of the higher education institution providing the study programme, its units, their management and interrelations, the appropriateness and weaknesses of the institution's organisational structure;

85.2. the composition of the self-evaluation group, the scope of the work and responsibilities of each member and the schedule of the team activities;

85.3. reference to the previous evaluation of the study programme, if any, and the evaluators.

86. The analytical part of the self-evaluation report shall cover six areas to be evaluated according to the criteria established in this Methodology:

87. The programme self-analysis report should have the following annexes attached to it:

87.1. study plan;

87.2. description of study subjects and/or modules (including description of the thesis and practice);

87.3. list of lecturers;

87.4. descriptions of the activities of lecturers teaching the study direction;

87.5. list of student theses;

87.6. summary of previous assessment conclusions (not longer than two pages).

87.7. agreement concluded among higher education schools performing the programme (when a joint programme is assessed).

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

87<sup>1</sup>. The first annex to the self-analysis report includes a study plan developed according to a form established by the higher education school. If the programme is envisaged in the form of full-time and part-time studies, the envisaged study plan shall be presented for both forms separately. The programme study plan shall show the programme structure, subjects (modules) taught by semesters, the number of credits granted. Study subjects (modules) shall be specified in the plan in accordance with their study direction, general university (college) study subjects, subjects of other directions if the objectives of the programme are linked to interdisciplinary studies. It shall specify practice, scope of optional courses (if available) selected by the student, thesis, number of credits granted to a minor study group where it is envisaged. It is also recommended to specify the form of completion of every subject, number of hours and the name of the lecturer teaching the subject.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

88. The second annex to the self-analysis report shall include descriptions of the programme subjects (modules). The descriptions shall be submitted in a form established by a higher education school, specifying the following necessary information: name of the subject (module) (in Lithuanian and English), code, number of credits and hours (specifying hours of contact and individual work), intended learning outcomes and their assessment criteria, links between study methods and student achievement assessment methods, content, main bibliography, etc. If the programme is assessed by an international expert group, descriptions of the programme subjects (modules) should be developed in the English language. If a higher education school has developed a publication specifying the information indicated in the paragraph about subjects (modules), excerpts from it could be provided without submitting descriptions of subjects (modules).

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

89. The third annex to the self-analysis report shall specify data about academic staff: first, last names and dates of birth of lecturers, subjects taught by them, their academic (artistic), pedagogical and practical work experience in years.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

90. The fourth annex to the self-analysis report shall include descriptions of the activities in which the lecturers teaching subjects in the field are engaged. A lecturer's activity description shall include the following information: the lecturer's first and last name, education, work place (specifying the position and type of work), significant academic (artistic), methodological work made during the last five years (not more than five works), foreign language level of proficiency. The activities of lecturers in the annex to the programme description shall be presented alphabetically (by last name). If a joint programme is provided, CVs of lecturers teaching in every partner higher education school shall be presented. It is not necessary to provide activity descriptions of lecturers teaching general university (college) study subjects.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

91. The fifth annex to the self-analysis report shall include lists of final theses of the last two years of graduates with grades.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

## II. ANALYSIS OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME

92. Study programmes shall be examined according to six areas and the criteria established in the Methodology.

93. The aim of the evaluation of the programme aims and learning outcomes shall be to

ascertain the validity and appropriateness of the need for the programme, its aims and learning outcomes.

94. Analysis of the programme objectives and intended learning outcomes should specify and examine the following:

- 94.1. programme objectives and intended learning outcomes;
- 94.2. findings of labour market and other surveys proving the relevance of intended learning outcomes;
- 94.3. fields of professional activity for which specialists are to be trained according to the programme analysed and their links with programme objectives and intended learning outcomes;
- 94.4. recommendations of previous assessment with regard to programme objectives and intended learning outcomes and information about how they have been taken into consideration.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

95. It is recommended that analysis of the programme objectives and intended learning outcomes should specify and examine the following:

- 95.1. data about periodic review of intended learning outcomes and participation of stakeholders in the process;
- 95.2. update of study programme objectives and intended learning outcomes by taking into account feedback obtained from students, employers, graduates and other social partners;
- 95.3. compliance of intended learning outcomes with legal or other documents specifying academic or professional requirements or recommendations for the qualification of trained specialists;
- 95.4. the place of the programme among other programme of the same direction taught at the higher education school.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

96. Evaluation of the curriculum design should seek to ascertain the appropriateness of the study plan and its contents.

97. Analysis of the programme structure shall specify and examine the following:

- 97.1. study plan;
- 97.2. descriptions of study subjects (modules);
- 97.3. rationale of programme development (links between programme learning outcomes and/or module/learning outcomes, content and methods of studies);
- 97.4. key study methods, their innovation and justification of application by seeking intended learning outcomes;
- 97.5. requirements set for student theses;
- 97.6. recommendations of previous assessment about the programme structure and information about how they have been taken into account.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-45, 2013-08-01, Zin., 2013, Nr. 86-4327 (2013-08-07)*

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

98. The aim of the teaching staff evaluation is to ascertain that the programme is being implemented by an adequately qualified teaching staff.

99. Evaluation of the teaching staff shall involve the analysis of:

- 99.1. the list of the teaching staff complete with information on each member's academic rank and scientific degree (if any); teaching experience; research interests; subjects taught; practical work experience in the area of the subjects taught;
- 99.2. description of each member's activities (to be presented as Annex 3 to the self-evaluation report);
- 99.3. information on the teaching staff's involvement in applied research, projects and research (artistic) activities directly related to the study programme being evaluated;
- 99.4. student/teacher ratio in the provision of the study programme;
- 99.5. data on the teaching staff exchange (visiting/outgoing teaching staff ratio);
- 99.6. recommendations of the previous assessment and information about how they have been taken into consideration.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

100. It is recommended that the analysis of staff should specify and examine the following:

100.1. data proving that the composition of staff is in line with legislative requirements;

100.2. data about the turnover of lecturers;

100.3. data about participation of lecturers in scientific (artistic) activities (scientific conferences, internships, seminars, etc.);

100.4. ~~Revoke the validity of Point 100.4 of Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes approved by Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 on the approval of Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes.~~

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

100.5. data about upgrading of lecturers' qualifications (pedagogical, scientific and practical) (number of lecturers that upgraded their qualifications, fields in which they have improved their qualifications and means of upgrading);

100.6. structure of academic staff by age groups;

100.7. workload of lecturers (workload of lecturers in the analysed and other programmes, time spent on academic and/other (e.g. professional) activities, etc.);

100.8. principles of selecting lecturers to teach the programme subjects (modules).

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

101. In evaluating facilities and learning resources it is necessary to ascertain that the learning materials, equipment and facilities are adequate to ensure a successful provision of the study programme.

102. Evaluation of this area should include:

102.1. data on the facilities used for the delivery of the programme and their capacity;

102.2. data on the equipment used for the delivery of the programme;

102.3. data on the facilities used for students' practice;

102.4. data on the teaching/learning materials available at the institution's library, reading rooms and subject rooms; access to e-publications, etc.

102.5. recommendations on material resources of the previous assessment and information about how they have been taken into consideration.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

103. It is also recommended to include and/or analyse information on the updating and upgrading of the learning resources.

104. Analysis of the study process and students' performance assessment should seek to evaluate the adequacy and appropriateness of such processes as student admission and selection, organisation of studies, student support and the employment success of graduates.

105. Analysis of the process of studies and its assessment shall specify and examine the following:

105.1. admission requirements;

105.2. competition grade average of students admitted to the study programme;

105.3. ratio between students admitted to the study programme and those who have successfully completed it;

105.4. data about the number of graduates and the (current and/or envisaged) need for specialists grounded by the data of national human resources monitoring, specifying the sources of data showing the need for such specialists;

105.5. scope and forms of student participation in scientific, artistic and applied scientific activities;

105.6. forms of student aid;

105.7. principles of the system of student achievement assessment;

105.8. list of theses written by the graduates of the last two years, specifying the name of the student, topic of the thesis, supervisor and grade;

105.9. means for ensuring student fair learning (prevention of plagiarism, cheating, etc.);

105.10 number of complaints, their reasons and complaint examination results over the last five years;  
105.11. number of students taking part in mobility programmes (specifying the number of programme students who left for part-time studies in other higher education schools and who came to the academic division from other higher education schools according to exchange programmes);

105.12. recommendations of the previous assessment about the process of studies and its assessment and information about how these recommendations have been taken into consideration.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

106. It is recommended that analysis of the study process and its assessment should specify and examine the following:

106.1. data about the results of admitted students to the programme:

106.1.1. number of applicants;

106.1.2. number of admitted students to the studies;

106.1.3. the highest and the lowest grade of students admitted to the studies;

106.2. data about progress of studying students (examination results) by linking them with the admission results and the number of dropouts;

106.3. data about dropouts, including the number and reasons (for each grade separately);

106.4. the ratio of time dedicated to lectures, practical exercises and individual work;

106.5. means of introducing students to the study programme, its requirements and the higher education school, their appropriateness and sufficiency;

106.6. data about the period during which students find employment;

106.7. data about the programme graduates, their overall employment and their employment according to their specialty (education) (including those who got employed prior to completing their studies);

106.8. opportunities that students have to choose subject and/or modules according to their needs;

106.9. examples of relevance of theses written by graduates during the last two years for public and private sector organisations and public at large;

106.10. data about the number of students who had practice in Lithuanian and foreign organisations during the last two years and examples of student contribution to such organisations.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

107. In evaluating the programme management, it is necessary to ascertain that the programme is properly administered and the internal quality assurance of the programme is effective and transparent.

108. Analysis of the programme management shall specify and examine the following:

108.1. structure of programme management and decision-making;

108.2. means (measures) that are used to ensure quality execution of the programme;

108.3. data about the involvement of stakeholders into the processes of programme assessment and improvement and their influence on improving the programme;

108.4. sources (factsheets, website, etc.) specifying programme objectives and learning outcomes as well as other information related to the assessed study programme and other means of information;

108.5. recommendations of previous assessment with regard to programme management and information about how they have been taken into consideration.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

109. It is recommended that analysis of the programme management shall specify and examine the following:

109.1. documents defining responsibility of programme executors;

109.2. opinion of the programme administration and lecturers about the distribution of responsibility;

109.3. documents regulating internal assurance of quality of studies in the higher education school;

109.4. data about the collection and analysis of information during the recent five years. If the programme lasts shorter all the data concerning the execution of the programme shall be submitted;

109.5. number of cases about the lack of tolerance and discrimination among programme students and staff during the last five years and prevention means against the lack of tolerance and discrimination applied by the higher education school;

109.6. means of raising awareness of higher education school (faculty) community and other stakeholders about the programme (self-)assessment processes and outcomes and the process of programme improvement and its effectiveness;

109.7. opinion of lectures, students, graduates and employers about the execution of the programme;

109.8. sources of information about the quality of studies.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

## IV EXTERNAL EVALUATION

### I. EXPERT TEAM WORK

110. The general principles of expert team formation and work shall be defined by this Methodology and the Procedure for Expert Selection.

111. In setting up an expert team, the Centre shall adhere to the principles of objectivity transparency, impartiality and reasonableness.

112. All the members of the expert team shall complete and sign a Declaration on the Expert's Interests and a pledge not make the information obtained during the evaluation publicly available.

113. Expert team members shall be guided by the principles of objectivity, impartiality, respect for the participants of the evaluation process, confidentiality and cooperation.

114. Objectivity principle. An expert shall be fair in his/her efforts to achieve the aims of the evaluation and to evaluate the study programme objectively. While expressing his/her opinion, formulating conclusions or taking decisions, an expert shall draw on precise facts and information and his/her own competence.

115. Impartiality principle. In evaluating a study programme, an expert shall act as an independent person, shall not represent any institution or any interests and shall rely on his/her own competence.

116. Principle of respect to assessment participants. During the assessment the expert acts in a professional and polite manner, does not abuse his or her position of an expert, does not exert any financial, psychological or other pressure. The expert shall consider the assessment participants as capable of taking responsibility for their activities. Therefore, when indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the programme assessed, the expert shall avoid giving advice about, in the expert's view, the best solutions.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

117. Confidentiality principle. All the information relating to the evaluation (issues considered at meetings, opinions offered by other participants of the evaluation, the self-evaluation report and documents provided for evaluation) shall be used strictly for the purposes of the evaluation and may not be divulged for any other purpose.

118. Principle of co-operation. By working in a team the expert seeks common objectives with the other group members and performs the tasks given in a group in a timely manner. By co-operating with the higher education school the expert gives advice to the higher education school on quality assurance and improvement issues and seeks common understanding.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr.V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference-code:2016-21004*

119. The work of the expert team shall be organised by the leader of the team, who shall chair the meetings of the team, set tasks for the team members and bear the general responsibility for the team's work. During the visit, the team leader shall chair meetings with target groups or appoint another member of the team to chair such meetings.

120. The expert team shall receive the self-evaluation report from the Centre. The Centre shall introduce the expert team to the Methodology and the main legal acts governing studies and their evaluation.

121. In their analysis of the self-evaluation report, the experts shall be guided by the criteria defined in this Methodology and other legal acts governing quality evaluation in higher education. Based on their analysis of the self-evaluation report, the experts shall produce a preliminary report and

determine areas and questions to be concentrated upon during the visit.

122. The visit shall be organised by the evaluation coordinator appointed by the Centre, who will coordinate the schedule of the visit with the higher education institution and the expert team.

123. During the visit, the expert team shall meet target groups such as the administration of the higher education institution and its units, the self-evaluation group, providers of the programme, students, alumni and their employers. The expert team shall also see the premises and equipment used for the implementation of the programme, students' term and final thesis, examination materials and other documents.

124. At the end of the visit, the expert group shall discuss the outcome of the visit and specify the spotted weaknesses and strengths of the programme to the school community.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr.V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference-code:2016-21004*

125. At the end of the visit, the expert team shall discuss the outcomes of the visit among themselves and present their opinion on the strengths and weaknesses of the programme to the institution's community.

## II. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME

126. The expert team shall evaluate the programme according to the areas and criteria defined in this Methodology.

127. After assessing every field of assessment according to the specified assessment criteria, experts should specify the strengths and weaknesses of each of them. They should also assess the efforts undertaken by the higher education school to improve the quality of the programme.

*Amendments to the clause:*

*Nr. V-66, 2016-07-22, TAR 2016-07-25, reference code: 2016-21004*

128. In evaluating the programme aims and learning outcomes, the experts shall determine the need for the programme and the validity and suitability of its aims and learning outcomes.

129. In evaluating the curriculum design, the experts shall express their opinion on the study plan and its content.

130. In evaluating the teaching staff, the experts shall evaluate the competence and adequacy of the teaching staff for the successful provision of the programme.

131. In evaluating facilities and learning resources, the experts shall determine the suitability and adequacy of the facilities, equipment and teaching materials for the successful provision of the programme.

132. In evaluating the study process and students' performance assessment, the experts shall determine the adequacy and effectiveness of the admission requirements and selection procedures, assessment of the students' performance, organisation of the studies and student support and the success of the graduates in finding employment in general and in their specialist areas.

133. In evaluating the programme management area, the experts shall establish the adequacy, effectiveness and transparency of the programme management and the internal assurance of the programme quality.

134. All the evaluation areas shall be evaluated according to the grading scale presented in the Evaluation and Accreditation Procedure.

## V. APPEALS PROCEDURE

135. In case it objects to the Centre's decision on evaluation, the higher education institution may lodge a motivated appeal with the Centre within 20 days of the dispatch of the decision.

136. The appeal shall be dealt with within 60 days of its receipt by the Study Programmes' Appeals Committee (hereinafter referred to as the Appeals Committee) on acting according to its regulations approved by the Centre Director's order. The Centre shall notify the higher education institution of the Appeals Committee decision by letter.

137. Both the decision of the Centre and the decision of the Appeal Commission may be appealed within

one month following the receipt of the decision in compliance with the procedure established by the Law on the Administrative Proceedings of the Republic of Lithuania.